UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01469814 6

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/fragmentseditedw01sophuoft

(72)
750
407

THE FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOLUME I

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100 PRINCES STREET

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

THE

FRAGMENTS
OF
SOPHOCLES

EDITED
WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES FROM THE PAPERS OF
SIR R. C. JEBB AND DR W. G. HEADLAM

BY

A. C. PEARSON, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

VOLUME I

144894.
15/1/18.

Cambridge :
at the University Press
1917

PA
4413
Y9
1917
V.1

PREFACE

THE production of this book has been delayed by various causes, which require particular notice on the occasion of its appearance. It is well known that Sir Richard Jebb intended ultimately to include the Fragments in his edition of Sophocles; and in pursuance of this intention he delivered at Cambridge in the Michaelmas Term of 1895 a course of lectures on 132 selected fragments. The *Ajax*, the last to be published of the seven extant plays, appeared in the autumn of 1896; and it was then anticipated that the publication of the Fragments would be undertaken in due sequence. But the discovery of the Bacchylides papyrus drew the editor's attention in another direction, and, during the remainder of his life, the time which he could spare from public duties was mainly devoted to the preparation of a comprehensive edition of the Poems and Fragments of Bacchylides, which was published by the Cambridge University Press in 1905. Thus it fell out that, when after Sir Richard Jebb's death the task of completing the edition of Sophocles devolved upon Dr Walter Headlam, the material available for his use consisted solely of the notes prepared for the lectures already mentioned.

Once again misfortune attended the prosecution of the scheme, in consequence of the premature death of Dr Headlam before he was able to put into shape the preliminary labour which for a number of months he had expended upon the text. Towards the end of 1908 I was entrusted by the Syndics of the University Press with the papers of both scholars, in order that the work so long deferred might be brought to a conclusion. I will frankly admit that, though conscious of having assumed

a serious burden, I did not at first adequately realize either the magnitude or the difficulty of the task.

I am afraid that, after these preliminary remarks, readers will be disappointed to find how small a share in the contents of these volumes has been contributed by my predecessors. Headlam, according to his wont, set to work thoroughly to explore the ground which he was preparing to develop, but he left very little evidence of the results at which he had arrived and hardly anything in such a shape as could be adapted readily for publication. Yet even the *adversaria* of so eminent a scholar are of considerable interest, and not a few instances will be found where his insight has pointed out the way leading to the solution of a puzzling problem. Jebb's notes were of an entirely different character. Although well fitted to introduce to an undergraduate audience the salient features of some of the most interesting fragments, they were obviously unsuitable for reproduction as containing the matured judgement of their author upon the critical and exegetical questions which these fragments raise. They were chiefly the record of first impressions drawn up with the skill and taste which we have learnt to expect from such a source, but made without much exercise of independent research or a full recognition of the departmental literature bearing upon the subject, so far as it was at that time accessible. To have printed any considerable portion of these notes would have been both misleading and unfair. Indeed, I am doubtful if I have not gone too far in including so much as will be found below; and it is with the greatest reluctance that I have in several cases quoted Jebb's notes, where I felt bound to argue in favour of a different conclusion. But my guiding principle has been this. The obscurity of the text of these fragments is so great, and so little has been done to dispel it, that we can only hope to arrive at the truth by a patient sifting of the clues suggested by competent authorities; and an editor may often best recommend the solution which he considers probable by canvassing the views of other workers in the same field. Anyhow by this method the reader is the better enabled to form his own judgement on the issues submitted to him: *securus iudicat orbis terrarum.*

It will now be apparent that not only the responsibility for

everything that appears in these volumes is entirely my own, but also the bulk of the commentary itself[1]. I must therefore explain the lines upon which I have worked. The general plan, modified only so far as was required by difference of subject-matter, was prescribed by the character of the earlier volumes, and, although my predecessors had not advanced far in the appointed track, they had at least made it plain that the chief feature of the book should be a thorough and searching exegesis. Translation was less essential than in the complete plays and often impossible; but in some of the longer fragments I am fortunate in being able to quote renderings made by Jebb and Headlam. In the elucidation of fragmentary and corrupt texts criticism and interpretation are complementary of each other. I have therefore endeavoured to present the critical data in as accurate a form as possible, taking Nauck's edition as my basis, and verifying, supplementing, and correcting its results so far as my opportunities permitted. It has not been possible for me to obtain unpublished information concerning the readings of the MSS of authors which have not been edited in accordance with the requirements of modern criticism; but I have endeavoured to make myself acquainted with published results, although I cannot feel confident of having surveyed every part of so wide a field. In this respect not much has been done since the appearance of Nauck's second edition. It is true that editions of Stobaeus and Plutarch's *Moralia*, two of our most important sources, have been completed by Hense and Bernardakis. But Hense's results had been already communicated to Nauck, and the character of Bernardakis's edition is such that it is almost entirely useless for the present purpose. Our knowledge of the most important scholia is still imperfect, although progress has been made, especially in regard to Aristophanes and Pindar. Wendel's edition of the scholia to Theocritus appeared while this book was passing through the press. Much might be learnt from a critical edition of Eustathius, which is scarcely to be expected at present. But the lexicographers are the most

[1] The letters J. and H. have been attached to the notes of Jebb and Headlam now first printed, and their full names are retained in references to their published writings.

promising field of all, and, though a good deal of work has been done in sifting their records, very little of it has seen the light. Bethe's Pollux and de Stefani's *Etymologicum Gudianum* are both incomplete. Here too the recovery of fresh material from unedited sources which may be still preserved in the libraries of Europe has been shown to be more than a possibility by the labours of Reitzenstein, Rabe, and others.

The actual increase of material that has accrued in the last twenty-five years is not completely measured by the fact that this edition contains almost exactly 100 more fragments than were published by Nauck. A considerable proportion of the accession comes from the recently discovered commencement of Photius, published by Reitzenstein in 1907. But the most important addition of all was of course the fragments of the *Ichneutae* and *Eurypylus* contained in the ninth volume of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. The discovery was made at a time when the greater part of the present commentary was written, and I am glad to be able now to express my thanks to Prof. A. S. Hunt, who was kind enough to allow me to inspect the sheets of the new fragments before publication, and has more than once replied to my queries concerning the actual readings of the MS in doubtful cases. I must also acknowledge my indebtedness to the Committee of the Egypt Exploration Fund and the Delegates of the Clarendon Press for permission to include the Oxyrhynchus fragments in the pages of this edition.

In the General Introduction I have endeavoured to describe the literary history of Sophoclean tragedy, to estimate the extent and variety of its activity, to discover the vestiges of the material with which it worked, and to show how its monuments were transmitted to posterity until they passed into oblivion and how finally its scanty relics were preserved for the instruction of our own times. In this way I have tried to answer the questions, why the majority of the plays were lost, and by what means their fragments survived. It will be evident that the third section follows in the main the lines which have been sketched in various writings by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. In dealing with the sources of our existing fragments I have entered at some length into the history of Greek philological literature

during the Roman and Byzantine ages, confining myself particularly to its connexion with the study of Sophocles. This is an arid region; yet I am convinced that those who make themselves acquainted with its chief features will return not only with a clearer understanding of the limits within which the criticism of the Greek poets must proceed, but also with a deeper respect for the honest labours of generations of workers who struggled against the forces of barbarism to keep alive the purity of the classic speech. So much misconception prevails as to the significance of quotations made by these writers that no apology is needed for the space which has been devoted to them. The only work of reference in English which touches this branch of literature is Sir J. E. Sandys's *History of Classical Scholarship*.

Shortly after the printing had commenced, it was decided to take advantage of the occasion by the preparation of a comprehensive index to the whole of the ten volumes. For this purpose Prof. Jebb's seven volumes have been carefully re-read, the old indexes have been consolidated, corrected, and considerably enlarged, and the entries so collected have been incorporated with those relating to the three volumes of Fragments. The work was at first undertaken by Mr G. V. Carey of Gonville and Caius College, who re-indexed the *Ajax* and *Antigone*; but, when he obtained a commission in the Army on the outbreak of the European War, the responsibility for the remaining portions passed into my hands. It is hoped that the new indexes will be of service to students not only as a better means of access to the information which the volumes contain, but also as a register of Sophoclean usage for anyone who may attempt further researches in the sphere of tragic vocabulary and grammar. At the same time their users should be warned that they do not pretend to be anything more than a record of the material comprised in the commentaries; for an attempt to provide by this means a complete digest of the language would have involved an enormous addition to a labour which was already sufficiently arduous.

I have elsewhere discussed and tabulated the researches of those modern scholars who since the close of the eighteenth century have laboured directly on the fragments of Sophocles,

and it is unnecessary to repeat here the nature of my obligations to them. Most of this literature is scattered in various periodicals or contained in dissertations which are even more difficult of access. In this connexion my thanks are due to Prof. R. Reitzenstein of Freiburg for supplying me with information respecting the contents of one of his dissertations which I had been unable to procure. Nor must I forget to mention the singular kindness of the late Dr Siegfried Mekler of Vienna, the editor of Dindorf's Sophocles in the Teubner series, who, hearing that I was engaged on this work, sent me a number of notes bearing on various points of difficulty. This will explain the occasional references to Mekler's unpublished views. Dr J. B. Pearson and Mr R. D. Hicks have kindly permitted me to print extracts from certain notes formerly communicated to Prof. Jebb in reference to frs. 776 and 1128. Notwithstanding the considerable output of labour directed to the criticism of the fragments, the attention which they have received is scanty in comparison with the mass of comment which has accumulated upon the extant plays. Hence I have been often compelled to rely largely on my own resources. This is, in fact, the first systematic effort that has been made to put together a continuous commentary, though I have the best of reasons for knowing that its imperfections are not due to that cause alone. I must warn readers that the printing of the book was seriously delayed by the stress of recent events and that it went to the press at the beginning of 1913. Everyone knows the difficulties and inconsistencies that are apt to occur in such cases, and that they cannot be satisfactorily cured by the list of corrigenda.

I desire to acknowledge the generous support which I have throughout received from the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, although the work has grown to a size which neither they nor I contemplated at the time of its inception.

A. C. P.

February, 1916.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

	PAGES
PREFACE	v—x
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	
§ 1. The number of the plays . .	xiii—xxii
§ 2. The subjects of the plays . .	xxii—xxxii
§ 3. The tradition of the text . .	xxxii—xlvi
§ 4. The sources of the fragments .	xlvi—xci
§ 5 Bibliography	xci—c
FRAGMENTS OF NAMED PLAYS:	
Introductions, text and notes . .	1—270

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The number of the plays.*

THE anonymous Life of Sophocles[1] records on the authority of Aristophanes of Byzantium that 130[2] plays were attributed[3] to Sophocles, but that 17 of these were spurious. The statement is entitled to credit, as coming from Aristophanes; and it has been referred with high probability to his work entitled *πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου πίνακας*[4]. Not much is known of the book in question, but it may be taken to have contained corrections and enlargements of the well-known *πίνακες* of Callimachus, which was not merely a catalogue of the books contained in the Alexandrian library, but included biographical details concerning the various authors, and in the case of the Attic drama the dates of the production of the several plays, as well as other points of interest drawn from the *διδασκαλίαι* of Aristotle[5]. External evidence.

Suidas, however, reports that Sophocles produced 123 plays, and according to some authorities considerably more. This information may be reconciled with the Life in two ways, *i.e.* by the adoption either of Boeckh's[6] correction of Suidas, which makes the total 113 (*ριγ'* in place of *ρκγ'*), or of Bergk's[7]

[1] xi p. liv Bl. *ἔχει δὲ δράματα, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοφάνης, ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα, τούτων δὲ νενόθευται δεκαεπτά.*

[2] *ρλ'* cod. A. Other MSS give *ρδ'*, which is the vulgate. There was clearly a confusion of the uncials Λ and Δ, and the evidence of Suidas indicates that the number intended was 130 rather than 104.

[3] *ἔχει* implies a reference to an established authority. The vulg. *ἐγραψε* should be rejected.

[4] By Dindorf and others. For the work itself see Susemihl, *Al. Lit.* I 393, 443; Nauck, *Ar. Byz.* p. 243 ff.

[5] See schol. Ar. *Nub.* 552; Susemihl, I 327 ff.; O. Schneider, *Callim.* II 306.

[6] *Tr. Gr. princ.* p. 110.

[7] In the Preface to his text of Sophocles (1858), p. xxxix.

substitution of 7 for 17 (ζ′ for ιζ′) in the Life. The latter proposal is palaeographically the easier, and the number 123 agrees better than 113 with the remaining data, as will presently appear.

Number of victories.

The number of his victories is also variously recorded. According to Suidas, they were twenty-four; according to the Life, which followed the authority of Caristius of Pergamum[1], twenty; and, according to Diodorus, only[2] eighteen. The last-mentioned statement is now confirmed by the evidence of a recently discovered inscription[3]. Further, we are informed by the Life[4] that, in addition to the twenty victories, he several times gained the second prize, but never the third. Cratinus[5] intimates that on one occasion at least Sophocles was refused a chorus altogether; but, even if the statement is literally correct, it is impossible to determine whether the plays written for that occasion were or were not included in the total number assigned to Sophocles by Aristophanes. It is conceivable, though not very probable, that the number of victories recorded by Suidas included occasions on which Sophocles received the second prize[6]. Others have thought that the inclusion of Lenaean victories is the cause of the discrepancy; and a parallel has been found in the case of Cratinus, who, though credited with only three victories at the Lenaea in the inscription already quoted, reaches the total attributed to him by Suidas by means of six others gained at the City festival[7]. This view is sufficiently plausible, and it would perhaps be unnecessary to look further, if it were not for the comparative unimportance of the Lenaea

[1] He belongs to the second century B.C. The reference is to his treatise *περὶ διδασκαλιῶν* (Athen. 235 E: *FHG* IV 359).

[2] 13. 103.

[3] *CIA* II 977 *a*, where [Σοφο]κλῆς ΔΓΙΙΙ was restored by Bergk (*Rh. Mus.* XXXIV 298).

[4] V p. li Blaydes.

[5] fr. 15 (I 16 K.).

[6] Cf. the use of *νικᾶν* in the fifth Argument to the *Nubes* (Arist. fr. 621 Rose).

[7] The explanation was first put forward by Bergk in *Rh. Mus.* XXXIV 298. It is accepted by Haigh, *Attic Theatre*[3], pp. 28, 46; but by a curious slip the number of the victories won by Cratinus at the two festivals is inverted. The text is thus at variance with the inscriptions quoted on pp. 363, 364. See also Wilhelm, *Urkunden*, p. 106.

in the history of tragedy[1]. At the same time, where numerals are concerned, we must not neglect their constant liability to suffer corruption[2]. However this may be, eighteen victories at the City Dionysia, where tetralogies were always produced, involved the performance of seventy-two plays. Of the remaining fifty-one in the Alexandrian list, it is reasonable to suppose, even when we bear in mind Sophocles' extraordinary popularity, that at least nine tetralogies—if not more—consisted of plays which obtained the second prize. The calculation leaves little room for exhibition at the Lenaea, so that, if performances at that festival are used to account for the twenty-four victories mentioned by Suidas, it would follow that the titles of many of the plays which Sophocles produced were unknown to the Alexandrians.

Objection has been taken[3] to the number 123 on the ground that it cannot be divided into tetralogies. But several explanations are possible. Thus, since the evidence concerning the Lenaea seems to establish the fact that tragedies were produced in groups of three rather than of four, the inclusion of such plays might account for the odd number. Or, again, since we know that the *Oedipus Coloneus* was not produced until after the death of its author, it is possible, as Dindorf suggested[4], that he left only three plays ready to be included in his thirty-first tetralogy, and that Sophocles the younger added the fourth. Further, it is almost certain that the *Archelaus* and *Andromache* of Euripides[5] were not included in the official lists of tetralogies (διδασκαλίαι); and it is quite possible that similar exceptions were known to exist among the authentic works of Sophocles.

[1] For the fifth century we have no evidence except the record of Agathon's victory (Athen. 217 A: cf. Plat. *Symp.* 173 A), and the inscription relating to 419 and 418 (*C.I.A.* II 971). From the latter it is inferred that each poet submitted three plays. The Lenaea was perhaps reserved for inexperienced or mediocre playwrights (Haigh, *op. cit.* p. 28).

[2] Bergk thought that ε' in the Life might be an error for κδ'.

[3] See Christ-Schmid, *Gr. Litteraturgesch.*[6] p. 315$_{8}$, where the statement of Aristophanes is now accepted.

[4] ed. 1860, p. xxxv.

[5] *Vit. Eur.* p. 4 Dind.; schol. Eur. *Andr.* 445. The latter passage has occasioned much curious speculation, which need not detain us here.

Early loss of plays.

In the next place, it will be observed that, whereas in the case of Euripides we have a definite statement that 78 plays out of a total number of 92 were extant at Alexandria[1], no similar information is available in relation to Sophocles. Yet the general probabilities of the case, as well as the analogy of the history of the other tragedians, forbid us to believe that Aristophanes had access to copies of all the plays whose titles were taken into account in his calculation of the total. The conclusion is assisted by the fact that losses of certain dramas are actually recorded in some of the extant Arguments[2]. Elmsley has shown[3] that satyr-plays in particular often failed to survive, so that their existence was only known from their appearance in the διδασκαλίαι: whether his criticism is applicable to the Sophoclean tradition will be considered later.

Numbers assigned to certain plays.

A further question arises in regard to the puzzling statement in the Argument to the *Antigone*, that the play is reckoned as the thirty-second[4]. The figures recorded for the *Alcestis*, the *Aves*, the *Dionysalexandros* of Cratinus, and the *Imbrians* of Menander, 17, 35, 8 and some figure between 71 and 79 respectively, require examination in the same connexion[5]; but for the present purpose we must confine ourselves to the *Antigone*. The extant Aeschylean catalogue suggests that the figure might refer to the alphabetical order, and some critics have inclined to this view[6]. Inasmuch, however, as some twenty-three titles beginning with A are known, in order to satisfy an alphabetical arrangement we should be obliged to assume that at least nine others were lost, and to place the *Antigone* last in

[1] For an elucidation of the tradition see Dieterich in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1247.

[2] See the Arguments to the *Medea*, the *Phoenissae*, and the *Acharnians*.

[3] On Eur. *Med.*[2] p. 239.

[4] See Jebb's Introduction, § 22. For λέλεκται as indicating a reference to a catalogue see Wilamowitz, *Anal. Eur.* p. 133.

[5] There is a discussion of the whole subject by R. C. Flickinger in *Class. Phil.* V 1–18. But the data have since been enlarged by the publication of Oxyr. Pap. 1233 (X p. 81 ff.), containing Arguments of Menander's plays. From this it appears that the *Imbrians* was numbered εβδομηκοστ[ην και....

[6] So approximately Susemihl, I 338[48], who professes to follow Wilamowitz (*Anal. Eur.* p. 135). The latter, however, thinks that the library arrangement was based on a compromise between alphabetical order and similarity of subject (*Einleitung in d. gr. Tr.* p. 150).

order or nearly so. The improbability of the double assumption is so great that we must look elsewhere for an explanation of the numeral. But the chronological solution is also open to objections of considerable weight. As the plays were produced in tetralogies, it is strange that the *Antigone* rather than a satyr-play should have been reckoned as the last play of the eighth tetralogy[1]. Further, if Sophocles only produced thirty-two plays in the first twenty-seven (or twenty-six) years of his dramatic career, it is surprising that he should have written as many as ninety-one in the last thirty-five (or thirty-six). However, the latter argument is not entirely convincing, since several reasons are conceivable which might favour an increased productivity in the poet's later life. Flickinger, who has made the most recent examination of the problem presented by these dramatic numerals, seems to be justified in concluding that their original function was to record the arrangement of the volumes in some library,—presumably the Alexandrian. If each play of which the library possessed a copy was distinguished by a numeral, it is unlikely that their arrangement was arbitrary rather than according to some rational system. For the purpose supposed a chronological basis becomes the more probable, since several of the early plays may have been lost; but we should still be obliged to infer that Sophocles increased the rate of his output subsequently to the date of the *Antigone*[2]. It should be added that the recently discovered evidence respecting the *Imbrians* of Menander entirely confirms this conclusion. An alphabetical solution is absolutely excluded by the remaining titles, and moreover, since the roll to which the fragment belonged seems to have contained an alphabetical series of Arguments, the fact that the numerical order of the plays was also recorded clearly points to some other principle

[1] The Lenaean hypothesis will not serve here, since tragedies were not performed at that festival until after 440 (Capps, *A.J.A.* iv 86). Bergk avoided the difficulty by reading in the Argument to the *Antigone*: διδιδάχθαι δὲ τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦτο τριακοστὸν δεύτερον <ἢ πρ>. Jebb has given good reasons for rejecting his proposal.

[2] Flickinger is perhaps right in seeking to minimize the importance of this increase, if it actually occurred; but why does he assume (p. 13) that only one hundred of Sophocles' plays were known to the Alexandrians?

of arrangement. On the other hand, although the date of the *Imbrians* may be open to argument[1], the chronological solution would not involve any serious difficulty.

Number of extant titles.

Now that we have examined the external evidence bearing on the number of the plays, we must enquire how far the number of titles actually known to us from quotations corresponds with the total of 123 plays said to have been recorded by Aristophanes. The number of actual or ostensible titles of which we have information, including those of the seven surviving plays, is at least 132, but there is hardly any doubt that this total must be reduced for the purpose of ascertaining the correct number of the plays which the titles represent. Five certain cases of double titles have been counted as single plays in the reckoning adopted above, *i.e.* Ἀτρεὺς ἢ Μυκηναῖαι, Μάντεις ἢ Πολύιδος, Ναυσικάα ἢ Πλύντριαι, Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλὴξ ἢ Νίπτρα, Πανδώρα ἢ Σφυροκόποι. These double titles were chiefly, if not entirely, a device adopted by the grammarians in order to distinguish plays bearing the same title but written by different authors[2]. It will be observed that in each case, except Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλὴξ ἢ Νίπτρα, the name of a leading character is combined with a name taken from the chorus; and in view of the prevalence of the latter among the titles of Aeschylus, it may be conjectured that the chorus-names Μυκηναῖαι, Μάντεις, Πλύντριαι, and Σφυροκόποι, were the original designations chosen by Sophocles. It sometimes happens that this practice of the grammarians, instead of tending to precision, is actually a source of confusion, when quotations are made by means of one or the other of the alternative titles, so that, unless there is independent evidence of the combination, two different plays appear to be cited. Thus it is highly probable that the Αἰθίοπες should be identified with the Μέμνων (I p. 22), the Κάμικοι with the Μίνως (II p. 4), and the Ἡρακλῆς (but not the Ἡρακλεῖσκος) with the ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ σάτυροι (I p. 167). The probable identity of the Ἐπίγονοι with the Ἐριφύλη (I p. 129) only differs in so far as Ἐπίγονοι is not a name given to the chorus, but serves, like Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας, as a succinct description of the subject-matter,

[1] *Oxyr. Pap.* x p. 83.

[2] Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 399 f.

—the second expedition against Thebes. The proposed identifications of the Δόλοπες with the Φοῖνιξ (I p. 120), of the second Φινεύς with the Τυμπανισταί (II p. 313 f.), and of the Φθιώτιδες with the Ἑρμιόνη (II p. 306), are much more disputable. A still more frequent source of error was the substitution for the true title of the name of one of the principal characters; but, though scholars seem sometimes tacitly to approve such combinations as Οἰνόμαος ἢ Ἱπποδάμεια[1], they are not really instances of double titles deliberately adopted by author or critic, but the results of lapse of memory, carelessness of citation, or confusion by a copyist. The matter is of so much importance not merely to the present investigation, but also to the arrangement and interpretation of the Fragments themselves, that we must first establish beyond the possibility of dispute that such errors are not infrequent. Now, the *Orestes* of Euripides is sometimes entitled *Electra* in late MSS (see *e.g. C.R.* II 172), just as conversely Longinus περὶ εὑρέσεως (Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* IX 589) refers to *El.* 1122 as spoken by Electra in the *Orestes*. Similarly, the *Phoenissae* appears as the *Oedipus* (*C.R.* II 172), the *Bacchae* as the *Pentheus*[2], the *Hippolytus* as the *Phaedra*[3], and the *Troades* as the *Hecuba*[4]. Hence we are not surprised to find that the *Oenomaus* is cited once as the *Hippodamia*[5], the *Daedalus* once as the *Talos*[6], the *Heracles* once as the *Cerberus*[7], and the *Tyro* once as the *Pelias*[8]. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that *Ion* was an alternative title for the *Creusa* (II p. 23), and *Clytaemnestra* either for the *Iphigenia* or the *Aegisthus* (I p. 219); but hesitation is pardonable before we accept the identification of the *Theseus* with the *Phaedra* (or the *Aegeus*: I p. 184), of the *Acrisius* with the *Danae* (I p. 38), of the *Aletes* with the *Erigone* (I p. 173), of the *Andromache* with the *Pastores* (I p. 78), or of the *Tyndareus* with the *Aletes* (II p. 268) It happens occasionally, though much less frequently, that a play is cited by the name not of a character, but of a person who is described

[1] The title is so printed by Dindorf and Nauck (*TGF* p. 233).
[2] So cod. L and the codd. of Stob. *flor.* 36. 9 and 74. 8.
[3] So cod. L and Eustath. *Il.* p. 490. 23.
[4] Welcker, *Gr. Trag.* p. 486.
[5] fr. 472.
[6] fr. 161.
[7] fr. 224.
[8] fr. 648.

or referred to by one or more of the speakers. We do not know enough about the *Licymnius* of Euripides to feel sure that the misquotation of fr. 472 in Bachm. *anecd.* I p. 412, 7 as coming from the *Heracles* is an error of this kind; but there can be no doubt in regard to schol. Plat. *rep.* 361 B, where Aesch. *Theb.* 579 ff. are cited as Αἰσχύλου ἐξ Ἀμφιαράου. A similar example is probably to be found in Soph. fr. 731, where, following Hartung, I have suggested that ἐν Ἰάμβῃ covers a reference to the *Triptolemus*, and the mysterious title Ξοανηφόροι (fr. 452) may perhaps be explained as an allusion to a particular scene in the *Laocoon*. An error more easily detected is the ascription of a play to the wrong author, that is to say, to Aeschylus or Euripides instead of to Sophocles, or to Sophocles instead of to Aeschylus or Euripides. In the result there may be occasional difficulties respecting the genuineness of individual fragments[1], but the discovery of the mistake seldom effects the removal of a title from one tragedian to another. Relying on the existence of this source of error, scholars have refused to credit the statement that Sophocles wrote a *Prometheus*[2]; and similarly Welcker conjectured that the titles *Ixion* and *Sisyphus* belonged exclusively to Aeschylus and Euripides[3]. Important additions to the text of Sophocles, which result from the recognition of an error in the statement of authorship, will be found in frs. 581 and 684. Another cause of disturbance is the doubt which exists as to the number of plays corresponding to the titles *Atreus* and *Thyestes*, and *Phineus* and *Tympanistae*; and it is uncertain whether the titles Ἑλένη, Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις, and Ἑλένης ἁρπαγή, imply the existence of three, two, or only one play.

When we have made allowance for all these disquieting considerations, we shall probably be disposed to deduct some twenty titles from the 132 mentioned above, so that of the 123 known

[1] For examples see on frs. 14, 1080, Eur. frs. 474, 515, schol. Hom. τ 471 (attributing Aesch. *Ag.* 282 to Sophocles), Hesych. I p. 227 ἀπαρθένευτα· οὐ πρέποντα παρθένοις. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰφιγενείᾳ τῇ ἐν Αὐλίδι (*i.e.* Eur. *I.A.* 993). Hence frs. 583, 769 and 941 have been assigned by some to Euripides.

[2] Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 5. 35, where however Schroeder suspects that a reference to the Κολχίδες (fr. 340) has fallen out.

[3] See I p. 213, II p. 185.

to Aristophanes of Byzantium we are still able to identify about 112. Of all these there is, so far as I can see, only one, the *Iberes*[1], of which it might be thought that it no longer existed in the Alexandrian epoch; and even of it we can only say that there is no positive indication of its survival. It has already been remarked that we have no record of the number of Sophoclean plays which were preserved in the Alexandrian library. Now, if Boeckh's hypothesis[2] were correct, it would follow that we are still able to trace practically all the genuine plays as having passed into the keeping of the Alexandrians. But it is in the highest degree improbable that copies of every one of them survived throughout the interval between the fifth and third centuries. On the other hand, if we accept 123 as the actual total of the genuine titles, we are now in a position to say that some 110 of the plays to which they belonged were known to the students of Alexandria. It is reasonable to infer that there are very few indeed[3] of which Alexandria has left us no trace, and the result is a very remarkable testimony to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of our sources.

The information available respecting the satyr-plays is not such as to disturb the previous calculation. There are sixteen plays universally admitted or strictly proved to be satyric[4]. To these we need not hesitate to add Δαίδαλος and Ἡρακλεῖσκος. The Ἶναχος and Σύνδειπνοι were either formally satyr-plays, or at least belonged to the same category as the *Alcestis*, so that they might have served as substitutes for satyr-plays in the last place of the tetralogy. Of the other titles those which seem most suitable for inclusion in a list of satyr-plays are Μοῦσαι, Σίσυφος, and Φαίακες; and, since the return of Perseus after his adventures was a favourite subject in this kind of drama[5], there

Satyr-plays.

[1] The relevance to Sophocles of this title is now disputed: Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 318$_1$.

[2] See p. xiii.

[3] It is possible that we know them all, just as we can identify all those of Euripides which were preserved: see Dieterich in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1248.

[4] The names are as follows: Ἄμυκος, Ἀμφιάρεως, Ἀχιλλέως ἔρασται, Διονυσίσκος, Ἑλένης γάμος, Ἔρις, Ἡρακλῆς, Ἴχνευται, Κηδαλίων, Κρίσις, Κωφοί, Μῶμος, Πανδώρα, Σαλμωνεύς, Τήλεφος, Τῦρις.

[5] Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 392.

is perhaps more to be said for Meineke's conjecture concerning the Δανάη than the particular evidence relating to it seems to suggest[1]. It is possible that we should add the *Chryses*, for reasons given in the Introductory Note. Satyr-plays were not produced at the Lenaea; but even if we make a liberal allowance for the inclusion in the list of plays performed at this festival, it seems clear that several satyr-plays were lost before the time of Aristophanes. This is no more than might have been expected, in view of the scantiness of the information concerning them which we owe to the Alexandrians[2].

§ 2. *The subjects of the plays.*

Classification of subjects.

The subjects chosen by Sophocles for the composition of his plays were taken exclusively from ancient legends. When we seek to analyse and arrange them, various methods of classification are possible. Thus the locality to which each particular story belonged might be adopted as the guiding principle of division; and such a course would be justified, if the dramatic stories rested chiefly upon oral tradition, gathered directly or indirectly from different quarters of the Hellenic world. But, except incidentally or when belonging to Attica itself, the material of tragedy is not drawn from myths of merely local circulation. It was shaped from the κλέα ἀνδρῶν which rhapsodes had sung from time immemorial throughout the length and breadth of Greece—καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος. Not that local associations are entirely to be neglected: the dramas whose scenes were laid in Attica, Boeotia, or Aetolia, tend to be grouped together, even where some other link has been chosen for their connexion. Genealogical affinity is a more promising point of departure. Every noble family could trace its descent,

[1] I pp. 38, 115.

[2] The effect of schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1124 seems to be that Aristarchus and Apollonius disregarded the satyric play in speaking of Aeschylean tetralogies (or trilogies) like the *Orestea*. The *Proteus* itself was familiar ground to the Alexandrians (*TGF* p. 70). They knew of only eight of Euripides' satyr-plays, including one of doubtful authenticity. The *marginalia* to the *Ichneutae* are very meagre. See also p. xvi3.

through generations of heroic ancestors, back to Dorus, Xuthus, and Aeolus, the sons of Hellen. The cherished unity of race was maintained by a network of relationships stretching from Thessaly to Sparta, and from Elis to Orchomenus. It would be easy, with the information at our command, to distribute among the chief houses the tales of the sufferings and achievements of their successive representatives. To this aspect of the matter we shall presently return. But the mythical past was not merely treasured in family chronicles; it supplied the record of the glorious beginnings of Greek history. 'Pelops' line' was linked indissolubly with 'the tale of Troy divine.' The orderly disposition of the early saga, which preserved it as the common heritage of later ages, was mainly the work of the epic poets. To Sophocles the legends of Hellas were permanently embedded in its poetry; and the task of cataloguing his plays will only be adequately performed, in so far as we succeed in discovering their literary sources.

Influence of Homer.

Although the data available for the reconstruction of the lost plays are lamentably scanty, we are generally in a position to recognize the chief features of the stories which Sophocles adapted for the stage. The surviving titles entirely confirm the testimony of Zoilus, the speaker in Athenaeus[1], that 'Sophocles delighted in the epic Cycle to such an extent that throughout the whole of a play he would follow closely the epic narrative.' To the same effect the author of the anonymous Life[2]: 'His plots follow in the tracks of Homer, and in several of his plays he produces an exact copy of the *Odyssey*.' But it was not merely in the structure of his plots that Sophocles was considered a follower of Homer. In the delineation of character and in the artistic expression of his thought the writings of Sophocles seemed to revive the charm of Homer's poetry[3]. Aristotle had compared the art of Sophocles with that of Homer[4]; and Polemo

[1] 277 E. For Casaubon's note on this passage see § 5.

[2] XII p. lv Bl. The words which precede (τὸ πᾶν μὲν οὖν Ὁμηρικῶς ὠνόμαζε) are unintelligible. Bergk proposed οἰκονομεῖ for ὠνόμαζε: one might also suggest Ὁμηρικὸς ὠνομάζετο.

[3] *vit. Soph.* XIII p. lv Bl. ἤθεσιοι δὲ καὶ ποικίλλει καὶ τοῖς ἐπινοήμασι τεχνικῶς χρῆται, Ὁμηρικὴν ἐκματτόμενος χάριν.

[4] *poet.* 3. 1448[a] 26.

the Academic took an equal pleasure in Homer and in Sophocles, declaring that Homer was an epic Sophocles, Sophocles a tragic Homer[1]. It was chiefly in respect of his diction that Sophocles was called 'the most Homeric' of Attic poets; but his most intimate point of contact with the Homeric spirit was his refusal to employ his art for the purpose of fostering religious enthusiasm, of promoting a purer morality, or of freeing the mind from conventional shackles, while he laboured to create afresh the heroic figures of ancient legend, and to present under new conditions the majesty of the life which Homer had first portrayed.

The Homeric element in Sophocles' style is easily recognizable, but the evidence which establishes his close adherence to Homeric models must not be taken to imply that, as a dramatic poet, he was deficient in inventive power. We infer simply that, in erecting the framework of his plays, Sophocles selected Homeric material to a larger extent than his fellow tragedians. For this purpose no distinction need be drawn between 'Homer' and the poems of the epic Cycle. Down to about 500 B.C. no doubt had arisen that the latter were actually written by Homer[2], and the popular conception remained unshaken until a much later date. When Aeschylus said that his tragedies were slices from Homer's ample feast[3], it is beyond question that he was not referring to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone. Indeed, it is extremely unlikely that the phrase 'epic Cycle' or even the notion which it expressed had come into existence during the lifetime of Sophocles[4]. What then precisely was the epic Cycle? The answer is given by certain extracts from the *chrestomathia* of Proclus the Neoplatonist[5], which are preserved partly in the

The Epic Cycle.

[1] Diog. L. 4. 20, Suid. *s.v.* Πολέμων.

[2] See T. W. Allen in *C. Q.* 11 88; the evidence is given by Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 92.

[3] Athen. 347 E.

[4] Monro, Hom. *Od.* p. 346, pointed out that there is no evidence of κύκλος ἐπῶν, or any such phrase, having existed before the time of Aristotle. Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 92, now take the same view. The inferiority to Homer of his rivals in the same field is asserted in Isocr. 12. 263, and the transferred sense of κυκλικός at Alexandria (Callim. ap. *A.P.* 12. 43) indicates that the notion of 'cyclic poetry' had been taken over from the Peripatetics.

[5] A considerable controversy has arisen in recent years over these extracts.

bibliotheca of the patriarch Photius (f. 318 B 21) and partly in MSS of Homer, *i.e.* chiefly in Ven. A supplemented by the Escurial and other less well known copies. What is called the epic Cycle commenced, according to Proclus, with the fabled union of Uranus and Gaia, and contained all the myths relating to the gods as well as such historical facts as emerged in the course of the description. It was the work of various poets, and came to an end with the landing of Odysseus on the coast of Ithaca, when his son Telegonus unwittingly slew him. Proclus adds that the preservation and currency of the epic Cycle were to be ascribed not so much to its merit as to the orderly sequence of events which it contained (*τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων*). The later extracts, which are on a larger scale, relate to the subject-matter of the Cycle, and comprise what purports to be an abstract, beginning with the *Cypria* and ending with the *Telegony*, of six epics covering the period of the Trojan war. The character of Proclus's evidence and the value to be attributed to it were materially affected by the discovery of its affinity to the mythographical handbook which, though known as the *bibliotheca* of Apollodorus, was certainly not the work of the famous grammarian of the second century B.C. The *bibliotheca*, as formerly known from the available MSS, broke off abruptly in the course of a description of the adventures of Theseus, but the discovery in 1885 and 1887 of an abbreviated form of the conclusion in two separate but parallel fragments proved that it originally extended as far as the death of Odysseus[1]. Now these fragments, so far as they comprise the Trojan story, agree so remarkably both in substance and in

Extreme views are represented on the one hand by Bethe (*Herm.* XXVI 593), who refuses to acknowledge that they have any value at all, and on the other by T. W. Allen in *C. Q.* II 64, 81, who seems to be almost alone in holding that the Cyclic epics survived until the fifth century A.D. It is not universally admitted that the grammarian and the Neoplatonist were identical. See W. Schmid in *Rh. Mus.* XLIX 133 ff. and *BphW* 1907, 5 f.

[1] The fragments were published respectively by R. Wagner from a Vatican MS (950) of the fourteenth century, and by Papadopulos-Kerameus in *Rh. Mus.* XLVI 161 ff. from a Jerusalem MS. They will be found, together with the extracts of Proclus, in the first volume of the Teubner *Mythographi Graeci* (ed. R. Wagner), 1894.

language with Proclus's epitome of the six Cyclic epics that there can be no hesitation in attributing to them a common origin. The inference is drawn that there lay at the basis of the mythographical compendium which was produced, whether by Dionysius the Cyclograph[1] or another, in late Alexandrian times, and was the common source of the extant mythographical literature, a composition known as the 'cycle of the events described by the epic poets' (*κύκλος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐποποιῶν ἱστορημένος*). From the inclusion of their works in this cycle the term Cyclic was transferred from the handbook to the poems themselves[2]. The Alexandrian *κύκλος* was not intended to serve a literary purpose, that is to say, the provision for readers of the old epics of detailed information about them, but rather to supply people of ordinary education with a succinct digest of mythical history based upon the writings of the ancient poets. Proclus indicates that the poems themselves were valued chiefly as authoritative records of the events which they described[3]. We should not therefore be surprised if the ostensible epitome, particularly in the form in which it has come down to us, is found to contain some elements foreign to the original sources, or even at variance with the other vestiges of our fragmentary knowledge concerning them[4]. Now, it will be observed that,

[1] Diod. 3. 66 is a passage often quoted: *Διονυσίῳ τῷ συνταξαμένῳ τὰς παλαιὰς μυθοποιίας· οὗτος γὰρ τά τε περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τὰς Ἀμαζόνας, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰλιακὸν πόλεμον πραχθέντα, καὶ πόλλ' ἕτερα συντέτακται, παραπιθεὶς τὰ ποιήματα τῶν ἀρχαίων, τῶν τε μυθολόγων καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν.* This quotation however refers to Dionysius Scytobrachion, the writer (among other works) of a 'romance' *Argonautica*, who is frequently cited by Diodorus and the scholia on Apollonius, and is sometimes confused (*e.g.* by Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 93) with Dionysius the Cyclograph. See Susemihl, II 45, 57; E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa V 928, 932. There were of course several such *κύκλοι*, among others that of a certain Theodorus, whose account was followed in the *Tabula Iliaca*.

[2] This account chiefly follows the article by E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa I 2875–2886. No apology is needed for the prominence given to the subject; for some understanding of the development of mythological literature between Hesiod and Hyginus is necessary to a correct appreciation of the evidence touching the subject-matter of the several plays.

[3] The reference must be assumed to be to the time when the *ἐπικὸς κύκλος* was put in circulation, perhaps in the first century B.C.

[4] These discrepancies were used by Bethe to assail the trustworthiness of Proclus. A flagrant instance is the statement in the epitome of the *Cypria* that Paris captured

although we have in Proclus a complete summary of the tale of Troy, we know nothing whatever about the epics from which the beginning of the cycle was made up. The analysis of the poems which covered the period stretching from the marriage of Uranus and Gaia to the opening of the *Cypria* is entirely lost. It is unfortunate that the gap cannot be filled up with material drawn from other quarters: for even though we might learn but little of their distinctive versions, it would be instructive to discover the names of those poems which Alexandrian Scholarship regarded as the most authoritative documents concerning the early myths. The reference in Athenaeus to Sophocles' fondness for the epic Cycle follows immediately upon a quotation from the *Titanomachia*, which suggests that that poem was included in the Cycle. But the first place in order of time is claimed for a Cyclic *Theogony*, which is to be distinguished from Hesiod's work of the same name[1]. The only other poems which by general consent are assigned to the epic Cycle are the *Thebais*[2], its sequel the *Epigoni*, and its precursor the *Oedipodea*. The relation of the Ἀμφιάρεω ἐξέλασις to the other Theban epics, and consequently to the Cycle, is quite uncertain[3]. The rest is guesswork: some favour the inclusion of the Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσις, of the *Phocais*, and of the *Danais*[4], but the supposed antiquity of their origin is the only reason for their selection. There is a general impression that the Trojan series was the longest and most important part of the Cycle, but it rests upon no other evidence than the accidental preservation of Proclus's abstract. The Ionian epos, it is true, culminated in the Τρωικά; but, if the ἐπικὸς κύκλος was such as we have supposed, it must have taken notice of Heracles and Dionysus, of the Argonauts, of Perseus, and of Theseus. Epics, in addition to those named above, on these and other subjects were written by Eumelus,

Solon after the abduction of Helen, notwithstanding the evidence of Hdt. 2. 117. The version of Homer was preferred for the handbook here as in other cases.

[1] *EGF* p. 5. There is no direct evidence of the existence of this work. See now Dietze in *Rh. Mus.* LXIX 522.

[2] τὴν κυκλικὴν Θηβαΐδα, Athen. 465 E.

[3] Introd. to Eur. *Phoenissae*, p. xix.

[4] Christ Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 100, treat these as outside the Cycle, owing to their non-Ionic character.

Cinaethon, and Asius; and these, as well as the anonymous *Phoronis*, *Alcmaeonis*, and *Naupactia*, must have exercised some influence upon Sophocles and the other tragedians. We may add the *Aegimius*, which is sometimes ascribed to Hesiod; but in their bearing upon Attic tragedy the most important of the Hesiodic poems was the γυναικῶν κατάλογος.

Classification of myths.

It appears from this discussion that, except in the case of the Trojan epics, and of these only in so far as we can rely on the statements of Proclus, it is impossible to make a list of Sophocles' literary sources so as to map out under each the plays whose plots are derived from them. The alternative has been adopted of arranging the plays according to the 'sequence of events' (ἀκολουθίαν τῶν πραγμάτων) as established by the handbook of pseudo-Apollodorus. It is true that this does not rest either directly or at all upon a series of abstracts or arguments (ὑποθέσεις) of poetical literature; and even where it seems to follow particular tragic authorities, it merely reflects the influence of tragedy upon the current conception of mythical history[1]. But the general outline which it presents corresponds in the main with the order in sequence of the myths as it was apprehended in the fifth century; and the genealogical framework by which the various episodes were held together must ultimately be traced to the influence of Hecataeus, of Acusilaus, and above all of Pherecydes of Leros, the somewhat older contemporary of Sophocles. The genealogies, again, though fixed and distributed by these chroniclers, were derived by them from early heroic poetry, perhaps above all from the κατάλογος of Hesiod[2].

I. Theogony. In the earliest age of the world, before the power of the Olympians was firmly established, was set the scene of the *Pandora*, the *Cedalion*, the *Triptolemus*, the *Thamyras*, and the *Ixion*.

II. Issue of Deucalion: the Aeolids. The Aetolian princes traced their origin to Aeolus through several generations descending from his daughter Calyce. The Aetolian plays are

[1] The τραγῳδούμενα of Asclepiades of Tragilus was just such a handbook of tragic mythology. The fragments indicate that if it had been preserved it would have contributed little to our knowledge of the works of the tragedians.

[2] Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 1213. Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 123, describe the κατάλογος as 'a versified text-book of heroic history.'

the *Oeneus*, *Meleager*, and *Hipponous*. Among the sons of Aeolus were Sisyphus, Cretheus, Athamas, and Salmoneus. Here then belong the plays (*a*) *Sisyphus*, *Iobates*; (*b*) *Athamas* (first and second), *Phrixus*; and (*c*) *Salmoneus*, *Tyro* (first and second). Cretheus, the husband of Tyro, was also the father of Pheres and Aeson, so that we may add (*d*) the doubtful plays *Admetus*[1] and *Eumelus*; and (*e*) the series of plays containing various episodes of the Argonautic adventure: *Lemniae*, *Amycus*, *Phineus* (first and second), *Tympanistae*, *Colchides*, *Scythae*, and *Rizotomi*. The Argonautic saga comes next to the Trojan in variety and extent; but, though there are several allusions to the Argonauts and their adventures in Homer, and many more in Hesiod, none of the Hesiodic poems, unless it be the third book of the *κατάλογος*[2], appears to have contained a complete narrative of the voyage. Of later epics the *Naupactia*, and the *Corinthiaca* of Eumelus, clearly related to this subject.

III. Issue of Inachus. In the play entitled *Inachus* Sophocles handled the intrigue of Zeus with Io, and the result of the jealousy of Hera. Epaphus, the son of Io born in Egypt, was the father of Belus and Agenor, who were the ancestors of the two stocks into which the Inachidae were subsequently divided. (*a*) Belus was the father of Danaus and Aegyptus, from whom was descended Acrisius through Lynceus, the son of Aegyptus, and Hypermnestra, the daughter of Danaus. Here then belong the plays containing the story of Perseus: *Acrisius*, *Danae*, *Andromeda*, *Larissaei*. The grandson of Perseus was Amphitryon, the putative father of Heracles. The Heraclean plays are *Amphitryon*, *Heradiscus*, *Heracles* (or *ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ σάτυροι*)[3], and *Trachiniae*. The story of Danae and Perseus is undoubtedly old[4], but we cannot identify any epic poem as the principal document from which the subsequent tradition started. The *Danais*, which has already been mentioned, seems to have contained the story of the Danaids. The kernel of the story of Heracles and his labours is believed to have been contained

[1] See n. on fr. 851.

[2] Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 1202, 1205 f.

[3] The identification is by no means certain: see p. 167.

[4] Hom. Ξ 319, Hes. *Scut.* 216.

in a Dorian epic which disappeared at a very early date and consequently exercised no direct influence on Attic tragedy[1]. Aristotle's slighting reference[2] shows that the poems which existed in his time were not of much account. An exception should perhaps be made in favour of the Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσις, one of the chief sources of the *Trachiniae*, which was attributed to the Ionian Creophylus[3]. (*b*) Europa, the daughter of Agenor, became the mother of Minos, with whose story are connected the plays *Daedalus*, *Camici*, *Minos*[4], and *Polyidus* (Μάντεις). Cadmus, the brother of Europa, whose journey in search of his sister brought him ultimately to Thebes, was the traditional ancestor of the Theban dynasty. The following plays are connected with the fortunes of his descendants: *Dionysiscus*, *Niobe*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Oedipus Coloneus*, *Amphiaraus*, *Antigone*, *Epigoni* (or *Eriphyle*), *Oecles*, and *Alcmaeon*. The Theban epics have already been mentioned.

IV. Pelasgus, according to some the son of Zeus and Niobe, but by others reckoned as sprung from the soil, stands at the head of the Arcadian genealogies. The Arcadian plays are the *Aleadae*, *Telephus*, and *Mysi*.

V. Arcadia was also the scene of the *Ichneutae*, which however occupies a separate class in view of its relation to the fortunes of Maia, daughter of Atlas the Titan.

VI. The Asopids. We are here concerned with the adventures of the descendants of Aeacus, the grandson of Asopus. The Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταί belongs here rather than to the Troica, but there is much doubt respecting the subjects of the *Peleus*, *Phthiotides*, *Dolopes*, and *Phoenix*.

VII. Cecrops the earth-born was the earliest figure in the mythical sequence of the Athenian kings. The Attic legends were favourite subjects with Sophocles and Euripides, and here if anywhere they were indebted to local traditions at least as much as to literary models. No doubt the outlines of the chief stories had been fixed by previous writers, but we know scarcely

[1] Wilamowitz, Eur. *Her.*[2] 1 69 f. [2] *poet.* 8. 1451[a] 20.

[3] See Jebb's *Trachiniae*, p. xviii. In the previous pages (xv ff.) the literary history of the Heracles myth is discussed.

[4] Perhaps an alternative title: see p. xviii.

anything about the *Theseidis* (*EGF* p. 217), and the *Atthis* of Hegesinus is attested by a solitary quotation of Pausanias (9. 29. 1). The plays in question are the *Tereus*, *Procris*, *Creusa* (*Ion*), *Aegeus*, *Theseus*, and *Phaedra*. The *Oedipus Coloneus*, which in form belongs to the Theban Cycle, is largely Attic in substance, and entirely in spirit.

VIII. The Tantalids. Here, as in the case of the Asopids, it is not possible strictly to separate the legends of the house of Atreus from the Trojan Cycle, but the *Tantalus*, *Oenomaus* (*Hippodamia*), *Atreus*, and *Thyestes* (first and second) clearly belong to the earlier period.

IX. Troica. Thanks to the evidence of Proclus, we are able to arrange the remaining plays under the titles of the epics which contain the Trojan cycle. (*a*) Κύπρια: *Alexander*[1], *Eris*, *Crisis*, *Momus*, Ἑλένης γάμος, Ὀδυσσεὺς μαινόμενος, Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος, *Iphigenia* (*Clytaemnestra*), Σύνδειπνοι, Ποιμένες (*Andromache*), Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις (ἁρπαγή), *Troilus*, *Palamedes*. (*b*) Αἰθιοπίς: *Aethiopes* (*Memnon*), *Phryges*[2]. (*c*) Ἰλιὰς μικρά: *Ajax*, *Philoctetes*, *Philoctetes at Troy*, *Scyrii*, *Eurypylus*, *Lacaenae*. (*d*) Ἰλίου πέρσις: *Laocoon*, *Sinon*, *Priamus*, *Antenoridae*, *Locrian Ajax*, Αἰχμαλωτίδες, *Polyxena*. (*e*) Νόστοι: Ναύπλιος καταπλέων, Ναύπλιος πυρκαεύς, *Aegisthus*, *Electra*, *Aletes*, *Erigone*, *Chryses*, *Hermione*, *Tyndareus*, *Teucer*, *Eurysaces*. (*f*) Ὀδυσσεία: *Nausicaa*, *Phaeaces*. (*g*) Τηλεγονία: *Eurvalus*, Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ.

The subjects of the following plays are entirely unknown: Ἅβηρες, Κωφοί, Μοῦσαι, Ὕβρις, Ὑδροφόροι.

If the number 112 is accepted as a probable total of the plays comprised in the preceding list, it will be noticed that 43 of them, or over 38 per cent., belong to the Trojan Cycle. A similar calculation applied to the plays of Aeschylus and Euripides yields percentages of 23 and 21 respectively. These remarkable figures entirely confirm the evidence relating to Sophocles' Homeric proclivities; and if the limits were enlarged so as to include the plays whose subjects lie on the borders of

[1] This play should in strictness have been associated with class V: cf. Apollod. 3. 150. But it would be inconvenient to separate it from the other Trojan plays.

[2] The subject of the play is extremely doubtful: see II p. 325.

the Homeric domain, the result would be even more striking. Want of information concerning the character and extent of the ἐπικὸς κύκλος prevents a closer enquiry.

§ 3. *The tradition of the text.*

Tradition of the extant plays.

The seven plays which still survive have been handed down to us in a number of MSS ranging from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, of which the oldest and best is the well-known Laurentian, written in the first half of the eleventh century. But, whereas twelve MSS contain all the seven plays, either complete or with *lacunae*, and fifteen others four or more but less than seven, no less than seventy are restricted to the *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Oedipus Tyrannus* alone, or to one or two of them[1]. The preponderance of the three plays is readily explained by their exclusive use for educational purposes during the Byzantine period. The existence of this selection may perhaps be traced as far back as to 500 A.D., if we may judge from the title of a treatise written by Eugenius, head of the imperial school at Constantinople under Anastasius I (491—518) and predecessor of Stephen of Byzantium in the tenure of that office[2]. The work was entitled κωλομετρία τῶν μελικῶν Αἰσχύλου Σοφοκλέους καὶ Εὐριπίδου ἀπὸ δραμάτων ιε΄[3]. That is to say, Eugenius, no doubt following earlier scholars, published analyses of the lyrical parts of the three tragedians similar to those which Heliodorus constructed for Aristophanes, but limited his activity to fifteen plays, three of Aeschylus, three of Sophocles, and nine of Euripides[4]. The number chosen corresponds to that of the plays selected from Aeschylus (*Prometheus*, *Seven*, and *Persae*), as well as of those taken later from Euripides (*Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*); and each of these groups consists of the first three plays according to the order of an earlier and larger collection. The history of the Euripidean tradition is more complicated, and does not concern us here, but the earlier collections made from

[1] The figures are taken from Jebb's text-edition of Sophocles, p. XIII f.

[2] Steph. Byz. p. 93, 1. [3] Suid. *s.v.* Εὐγένιος.

[4] So Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa VI 987; Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* II[5] p. 879; Sandys, *Hist. Cl. Schol.* I 402; and C. H. Moore in *C. R.* XIX 12. Wilamowitz, *Einleitung*, p. 197[152], thinks the statement obscure.

the works of Aeschylus and Sophocles undoubtedly comprised the fourteen plays which still exist. It must be recognized therefore that the survival of particular plays is due not to the accidental preservation of this or that MS from which all other copies were derived, but rather to the educational needs which prompted scholars to prepare annotated editions of select plays for the use of schools. Of the circumstances attending the publication of the earlier collection hardly a trace remains. An Argument is attached to each of the two plays *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Antigone* bearing the name of a certain Sallustius, and in the former he is described as Sallustius Pythagoras. In all probability therefore there was a tradition identifying him with Sallustius the Pythagorean[1], the follower of Iamblichus and author of the treatise *περὶ θεῶν καὶ κόσμου*[2], who belonged to the latter part of the fourth century. This writer is probably the same man as the friend of the emperor Julian, and has also been identified with the sophist Sallustius to whom Suidas ascribes commentaries on Demosthenes and Herodotus[3]. Now, if Sallustius, the editor of the select plays, lived at so late a date as the second half of the fourth century, it is unlikely that he was the first compiler of the selection[4]. It will be shown later that the direct quotation of tragedies other than those contained in the select edition died out at the end of the second century. Further, it may be inferred, from the precise correspondence in subject between the plays chosen from each of the three great tragedians which contain the stories of Oedipus and Orestes, that the whole selection was made by a single person. Beyond this it is impossible to determine either author or date. Wilamo-

[1] The title of the Argument is given in L as *σαλουστίου ὁ πυθαγόρου*. Dindorf conjectured that *πυθαγόρου* was the blunder of someone who did not perceive that the abbreviation represented *ὑπάθεσις*, but the view of Wilamowitz as stated above is preferable. F. Cumont, *Rev. de Philol.* XVI 53, rejecting the identification, points out that Sallustius was a Neo-Platonist.

[2] For this work and its author see Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 163 ff.

[3] A grammarian Sallust is quoted in schol. Ar. *Plut.* 725. Cumont assigns him to the sixth century.

[4] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 199. Pius, a commentator on Sophocles, who is assigned to the second century (Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* p. 345), is mentioned in schol. *Ai.* 408.

witz, who has once for all laid down the conditions of the problem, arrived at the conclusion that the selection was first made in the age of Plutarch, and after the lapse of a century secured universal acceptance[1].

Athens to Alexandria.

We shall now proceed to give some account of the Sophoclean tradition in antiquity in order to prepare the way for an examination of the sources from which our knowledge of the lost plays is derived. The existence of written copies of Attic tragedies can be traced back to the period of their production, that is to say, to a date not later than the close of the fifth century B.C., as is proved by the well-known passage in Ar. *Ran.* 52 where Dionysus speaks of reading to himself the *Andromeda* of Euripides; and the force of v. 1114 of the same play is very much impaired if we do not understand it as implying that the text of the tragedians was studied in literary circles. The learning by heart of tragic ῥήσεις is mentioned by Plato[2], and Alexis includes tragedies in a list of books which are recommended for the improvement of Heracles, who however chooses a cookery-book in preference to all of them[3]. The earliest recognition of the necessity for maintaining the integrity of the tragic texts is to be found in the law of Lycurgus the orator, which required that an official copy of the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides should be preserved in the archives, and that in future performances the actors should adhere to the text of this copy[4]. It has been suggested that the official text only contained such plays as still kept the stage in the fourth century, but, as the plays of Aeschylus were seldom reproduced at that time[5], it was probably more comprehensive. In fact, if such an official copy was ever made, although its primary purpose was not so much directly critical as to check the licence of the actors, it may be presumed that the net was cast as wide as possible, and that the most authoritative sources were consulted[6]. It is

[1] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 202.

[2] *legg.* 811 A: cf. Herond. 3. 30.

[3] fr. 135, II 345 K.

[4] Plut. *vit. X orat.* p. 841 F. The documents were no doubt preserved in the Metroum (Frazer's *Pausanias*, II p. 68).

[5] Haigh, *Attic Theatre*[3], p. 76.

[6] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 131, hardly allows so much. But his view that the

enerally supposed that this was the copy subsequently borrowed y Ptolemy Euergetes, when he left a deposit of fifteen talents s security for its return. His professed object was to make transcript for his own use; but, when this had been done, he ent back the transcript to Athens in place of the original, and he Athenians were obliged to content themselves with a forfeit f the deposit[1]. It may be open to doubt whether the reference s to Euergetes I (247—221 B.C.) or to Euergetes II Physcon 146—117 B.C.)[2], although the former is generally preferred; but he historical truth of the story is of less importance than he inferences to which it leads. Thus the acquisition of the fficial copy was certainly not regarded as having settled the ext of the tragedians, for otherwise the conjectures of Aristo- hanes would not have been recorded in our scholia. A still nore important fact to which the story testifies is the migration f tragedy in the third century from Athens to Alexandria[3], oth as the home of the Alexandrian Pleiad, and as the place here the study of the old tragedians was pursued with the reatest zeal. It is to Alexandria that we owe our existing exts, and almost the whole of the information that can be ecovered concerning the lost plays.

Peripatetics.

Aesthetic and historical criticism of the tragedians had been pursued almost exclusively by the Peripatetics in pre-Alexandrian imes. With the former we are not immediately concerned, but n the historical side the publication of Aristotle's *διδασκαλίαι* vas of considerable importance. This work was a collection of xtracts from the archives giving the dates and circumstances f production of all the tragedies and comedies recorded in the fficial lists. The particulars which the archon registered were he names of the competing poets and their plays, of the choregi, nd of the leading actors, and the order in which the competitors vere placed by the judges. The concluding sentences of the

rdinance was probably ineffective is to be preferred to Rutherford's contention that he story is inconsistent with the references to actors' readings in the scholia to Euripides (*Annotation*, pp. 57–60).

[1] Galen *in Hippocr. epidem.* III 2 (XVII 1. 607 K.).

[2] Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, I p. 58. The later date is advocated y Usener in Susemihl, *op. cit.* II 667, but see *ibid.* p. 682.

[3] Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 439 ff.

Argument to the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus had been recognized as a fragment of Aristotle's treatise[1], and a remarkable confirmation of the accuracy of our tradition came to light in 1886, when an inscription was discovered on the Acropolis, recording the production of the *Orestea*, and agreeing exactly in the facts which it mentions with the text of the Medicean MS[2]. But the stone-inscription was not the original record; for, so far as the contests listed were earlier than Aristotle's time, the details to be inscribed were taken from his book or were otherwise due to his researches[3]. Aristotle also wrote a treatise in one book entitled *περὶ τραγῳδιῶν*, and another also in one book entitled *νῖκαι Διονυσιακαί*[4]. Of the former nothing whatever is known, and there is no probability in Mueller's view[5] that it was related to the *διδασκαλίαι* as a part to the whole or vice versa. We are equally in the dark regarding the *νῖκαι Διονυσιακαί*, but it is a plausible conjecture that it contained lists of winners in the various contests at the Dionysia, the existence of which, beside the more elaborate records relating to tragedy and comedy alone, is proved by inscriptions[6]. Dicaearchus of Messene (*c.* 310 B.C.) displayed no less interest than his master in the province of dramatic criticism. His work *ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων*[7] was an investigation into the subject-matter of the plots of the various plays of Euripides and Sophocles, and especially into the sources from which they were derived, the extent of their deviations from the traditional versions, and the reasons which prompted such individual treatment[8]. Traces of the handiwork of Dicaearchus are to be seen in the first of the existing Arguments to the *Alcestis* and the *Rhesus*. Another of his works,

[1] fr. 618 Rose.

[2] *CIA* IV 971; first published in Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1886, p. 267. The inscription belongs to the class of victors' lists and is therefore not to be connected with the *διδασκαλίαι*.

[3] Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen*, pp. 13—15.

[4] Diog. L. 5. 26.

[5] *FHG* II 182.

[6] *CIA* II 971 as contrasted with 972, 973, 975. See further Haigh, *Attic Theatre*[3], p. 47; Reisch in Pauly-Wissowa V 398.

[7] *FHG* II 247.

[8] The result was established by H. Schrader, *quaest. Peripateticae*, Hamburg, 1884. The work of Dicaearchus was more scientific than the *τραγῳδούμενα* of Asclepiades, the character of which has already been explained (p. xxviii).

the *Διονυσιακοὶ ἀγῶνες*, probably a subdivision of the more comprehensive title *περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων*, contained various items of information relating to the history of the Attic stage. Of less account is Hieronymus of Rhodes (*c.* 290—230 B.C.), another Peripatetic, who is quoted once or twice by Athenaeus as the source of certain anecdotes relating to Sophocles[1], and may be compared with Dicaearchus as having been responsible for the statement that the plot of Euripides' *Phoenix* was drawn from the annals of a village community[2].

Alexandrian studies.

Passing to Alexandria, we find that at an early date (*c.* 285 B.C.) Zenodotus, the first librarian, shared with Lycophron and Alexander Aetolus the task of putting in order the books in the library, and that to Alexander was assigned the special duty of superintending the arrangement of the tragedies and satyr-plays[3]. Callimachus, who succeeded Zenodotus, completed the catalogue which his predecessor had begun and published it in 120 books under the title *πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμψάντων καὶ ὧν ξυνέγραψαν*. This celebrated work was more than a catalogue, since it contained biographical and other details of literary history, and, in the case of the dramatic writers, notices drawn from Aristotle's *διδασκαλίαι*[4] relating to the production of their plays at the Dionysia. Eratosthenes (*c.* 245 B.C.) confined his studies in the Attic drama to the production of a work on comedy (*περὶ ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας*), but Aristophanes of Byzantium, who became chief librarian on the death of Eratosthenes (195 B.C.), was the first critic who laboured continuously on the text of the tragedians, and by his investigations laid a secure foundation for the benefit of later generations. We have already had occasion to refer to his work *πρὸς τοὺς Καλλιμάχου πίνακας*, which seems to have contained corrections of and additions to the treatise of Callimachus[5]. But his influence in the sphere of textual criticism was of much greater importance. There is no doubt whatever that he edited Euripides, for the allusions to him in the scholia do not admit of any other ex-

[1] *FHG* II 450 n. See also *vit. Soph.* vi. His book was entitled *περὶ ποιητῶν*.
[2] *TGF* p. 621. [3] Knaack in Pauly-Wissowa I 1447.
[4] Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 552. For the whole subject see O. Schneider, *Callimachea*, II 297 ff. [5] Athen. 408 *b*.

planation. There is no similar evidence to prove that he was also responsible for editions of Aeschylus and Sophocles; but, since no other assumption accounts equally well for the existence of the *ὑποθέσεις* attributed to him which are attached to plays of all three tragedians[1], recent scholars have been unanimous in so concluding[2]. It may be added that the discovery of the *Ichneutae* papyrus, with marginal variants attributed to Aristophanes[3], makes strongly in the same direction. Wilamowitz argued that the *ὑποθέσεις* were not accompanied by a commentary on the text, and that the edition of Aristophanes was intended rather for the general reader than for scholars[4]. However this may be, there is evidence that he wrote a *ὑπόμνημα*—or what we should call 'lecture-notes'—on the *Orestes*, as well as on other plays[5]; and much of the aesthetic criticism which is found in the scholia to Sophocles and Euripides has been attributed to him. We must not forget his lexicographical studies, plentiful remains of which are to be found in Eustathius, and less patently in Hesychius, Pollux, and Athenaeus, not to mention the excerpts still existing in medieval MSS which have been published by Boissonade and E. Miller[6]. These studies were entitled *λέξεις*[7] or *γλῶσσαι*, and were divided into two main classes: (1) collections of dialectical variants, (2) varieties of subject-matter (*e.g. περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν, περὶ συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων*). It was probably in this work that Aristophanes explained *ἐμασχαλίσθη* in *El.* 445[8]; unless the reference should

[1] His name appears at the head of a *ὑπόθεσις* to the *Antigone*, and there are good reasons for referring to him also the anonymous Arguments to the *O. C.*, *El.*, and *Phil.*, or at any rate parts of them.

[2] Wilamowitz, p. 145; Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa II 998; Susemihl, I 442; Sandys, p. 128 f.

[3] His name appears in schol. *Ichn.* 73, 137, 140, 215.

[4] This conclusion is based chiefly on the fact that those plays of Euripides which have no scholia (*e.g.* the *Supplices*) nevertheless show traces of the learning of Aristophanes.

[5] Wilamowitz, p. 151 ff.

[6] Boissonade, *Herod. Epim.* p. 283; Miller, *Mélanges de lit. gr.* p. 427 ff. The best account of Aristophanes' lexicography is by L. Cohn in *Jahrb. f. cl. Philol.* Suppl. XII 285—374.

[7] Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 684.

[8] Suid. Phot. *s.v. μασχαλίσματα.* See on fr. 623.

be taken to indicate that he published a *ὑπόμνημα* on the *Electra*[1]. Callistratus, a pupil of Aristophanes, followed up his master's researches in the dramatic sphere, and, although his name is better known from its frequent occurrence in the scholia to Aristophanes and Euripides, there is evidence that he also wrote commentaries on Sophocles[2]. Aristarchus (216—144 B.C.), the most renowned of all the Alexandrian critics, was a fellow-pupil and rival of Callistratus. The fame of his labours on Homer has thrown into the shade his work on other poets; but Dionysius Thrax[3] testifies that his familiarity with the tragic texts was so great that he was able freely to recite them from memory. We meet with his name here and there as a witness for a particular fragment[4], and fr. 449 and schol. *El.* 6 (Hesych. *s.v.* *λυκοκτόνου θεοῦ*) are sufficient to prove his interest in the interpretation of the text. Nevertheless, as compared with that of Aristophanes, his influence upon the course of subsequent research was slight. With Aristarchus should be named his chief opponent Crates of Mallus, the most distinguished representative of the Pergamene school, who wrote upon Aristophanes and Euripides, but is not proved by extant quotations to have given special attention to Sophocles[5].

Roman period.

We have now reached a period in which the political supremacy of Rome began to exercise an attraction upon the intellectual activities of the Hellenistic world. At the time when Aristarchus was acknowledged to have reached the fullness of his critical powers the glories of the kingdoms of Ptolemy, Attalus, and Seleucus had passed. Hitherto in Italy, although there was a considerable amount of colloquial familiarity with the Greek speech, the cultivation of Greek letters had been confined to a limited circle. Ennius (239—169 B.C.), who was half a Greek by birth, and earned his living by his skill as a teacher and writer, came forward as a propagandist of Hellenism, with the support of Publius Scipio and other leading nobles.

[1] But it is hardly to be supposed that he was the author of the anonymous *ὑπόμνημα* quoted by schol. L on 451, 488.

[2] Schol. cod. Barocc. *Ar.* 283. R. Schmidt, *de Callistrato*, p. 324.

[3] *Etym. M.* p. 277, 55.

[4] fra. 449, 624, 728.

[5] Hecker introduced his name by emendation in schol. *O. C.* 100.

His tragedies were for the most part adaptations of Euripides, and he was followed by Pacuvius (219—129) and Accius (170—105), who constructed their plays with greater skill and included Sophocles among their models. Unfortunately the fragments of these writers are so scanty that they are very seldom of service in the reconstruction of the Greek originals[1]. The Romans were thus familiarized through the stage with the form and contents of Greek tragedy before they were trained to study them as literature. But after 146 B.C. the assimilation of Greek culture spread rapidly. That which was at first the exclusive possession of the Scipionic circle became in the next generation the common heritage of every educated Roman. The ever-increasing demand for instruction brought the learning of Pergamum and Alexandria into contact with the ruling class of the imperial city. Educational requirements not only gave an enormous stimulus to the multiplication of copies of the most famous Greek authors, but grammar and criticism themselves were internationalized. Alexandria ceased to be the home of the most learned professors, and gradually lost its supremacy in the world of letters, although, as the birth-place of Didymus, Herodian, Harpocration, and many others, it continued for three centuries to preserve its reputation as the ultimate source of philological erudition. It is not surprising, in view of these circumstances, that the name of Didymus, who, after the lapse of more than a century, comes next on the list of Sophoclean editors, should be associated with a change in method calculated to adapt his lucubrations to the requirements of the Roman world.

Didymus.

Didymus is the most important name in our survey, not so much in consequence of his individual merit, although this has perhaps been undeservedly belittled, as because we owe to him more than to any other single person the preservation of such fragmentary knowledge as we possess respecting the lost plays of the Greek tragedians. The extraordinary industry of Didymus, which earned for him the epithet χαλκέντερος, may be estimated by his performance in the field of literary criticism alone, in

[1] The leading authority on the plots of the Roman tragedians is O. Ribbeck, *die Römische Tragödie*, Leipzig, 1875.

which he undertook the interpretation of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar and Bacchylides, the tragedians, Aristophanes and other comic poets, and the Attic orators. The importance of his collections to modern research becomes apparent when we learn that large portions of the existing scholia to Pindar, Euripides, and Aristophanes are drawn from the commentaries of Didymus, and that his writings are the ultimate source of the scholia to Sophocles. It is significant that in these, while the names of the older Alexandrian grammarians are scarcely mentioned or else are replaced by such general descriptions as 'the commentators[1],' that of Didymus occurs at least nine times[2]. These commentaries were not simply *ὑπομνήματα* in the sense previously indicated, but were accompanied by a text[3]. The older grammarians had lectured to their pupils from a plain text, but conditions were now very different, and the wider public for whom the editions of Didymus were intended could not dispense with explanatory notes. The function of Didymus should not be misconceived. He was neither an original thinker nor an independent investigator: his province was to collect the results garnered by earlier scholars, and to make them serviceable to the needs of his contemporaries and his successors. It has been inferred that these books were the prototypes of the class afterwards represented by the medieval MSS, in which the margins surrounding the text are occupied with exegetical comment and critical variants[4]. Recent discoveries of papyri, which have been sufficiently numerous to familiarize us with the form and aspect of the papyrus roll, have only partially confirmed this conclusion. It is true that critical and explanatory notes are found in them,

[1] See Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa v 452. There is a good instance in schol. *Ant.* 45, which shows that they were anterior to Didymus.

[2] For Didymus as an interpreter of Sophocles see also fr. 718. *Etym. Gud.* p. 81. 37 (*Trach.* 1054) is to be added to the passages in which Didymus is referred to by name.

[3] This is proved by schol. *O. C.* 237, *Ai.* 1225. The account given above follows Wilamowitz, p. 166. He finds in the scholia to the *O. C.*, besides the work of Didymus, traces of a *ὑπόμνημα* devoted chiefly to the explanation of antiquarian and mythological details. Cohn, however, is inclined to refer this part also to Didymus.

[4] Wilamowitz, *l.c.* The same opinion is maintained in '*Die griech. Literatur des Altertums*' in *Kultur d. Gegenwart*, I viii[2] (1907) p. 96. See also Susemihl, II 701.

and particularly in the Paris fragments of the Parthenion of Alcman, which are ascribed to the first century A.D., and the Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the Paeans of Pindar, which belongs to the early part of the second. But they are very scantily represented in the *Hypsipyle* and *Ichneutae* papyri, and there are obvious reasons why a continuous commentary was less suitable for inclusion in the papyrus roll than in the parchment book of a later age. It follows that the existing scholia, although in substance based upon the results of Alexandrian learning, are not formally and directly the completion of an original Alexandrian nucleus[1]. The growth of the various collections cannot be traced in detail, since for the most part the secure support of names and dates is wanting[2]. A glance at Nauck's Index of Sources will show that many of the fragments are quoted in the scholia to the writers enumerated above, but a still greater number is derived from the lexicographical labours of Didymus. The prefatory letter to Eulogius, which Hesychius placed in the forefront of his lexicon, refers to the separate vocabularies of comic and tragic diction (λέξεις) which Theon and Didymus had composed. According to recent critics[3], the meaning is not that Theon was the author responsible for a κωμικὴ λέξις and Didymus for a τραγικὴ λέξις, but that each of them made a collection of the idioms and phraseology of both branches. The scope of Theon's activity is obscure in the absence of further information, but we shall presently return to him. So far as Didymus is concerned, there is ample evidence elsewhere to confirm the statement of the letter that he published a κωμικὴ λέξις as well as a τραγικὴ λέξις. The τραγικὴ λέξις was arranged according to the alphabetical order of the words, and divided into books, of which Harpocration quotes the twenty-eighth[4]. Further, it should be noted that the lexicon was closely connected with the separately published commentaries to the tragic poets. It is a natural assumption that it contained a series

[1] The issue involved is fully discussed with the result explained above by J. Williams White in his *Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes*, pp. liii—lxiv.

[2] The position of Sallustius in regard to Sophocles has already been mentioned (p. xxxiii).

[3] Cohn, *l.c.* 461.

[4] p. 134, 2, *s.v.* ξηραλοιφεῖν (Soph. fr. 494).

of lexicographical excerpts from the commentaries, and the identity of treatment is proved by examples of the same matter expressed in the same words by the lexicographers, who used only the λέξεις, and the scholia, which derive from the commentaries of Didymus[1]. Of course the lexicographical notes of Didymus were largely a compilation from the λέξεις of Aristophanes, from the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις of Crates of Mallus, and other authorities too numerous to mention. But the τραγικὴ λέξις, in its turn, became a treasure-house for successive plunderers to rifle. A lexicon, as Wilamowitz remarks[2], soon ceases to be left intact, as befits a private possession: each succeeding generation reconstructs, abbreviates, or enlarges, according to its needs. Pamphilus of Alexandria, who belonged to the middle of the first century A.D., and was the last of the Aristarcheans, incorporated the τραγικὴ λέξις in his encyclopaedic treatise entitled λειμών or περὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ ὀνομάτων in ninety-five books. His object was to collect and enlarge the departmental labours of his predecessors in their various provinces. The first part of the work (περὶ γλωσσῶν) contained the lexicons devoted to particular authors, branches of literature, and dialects[3]; and the second (περὶ ὀνομάτων) was divided according to varieties of subject-matter (cookery, shipbuilding, and so forth). In the reign of Hadrian appeared an epitome (Ἑλληνικὰ ὀνόματα) by Julius Vestinus, probably in thirty books[4]. But for practical purposes even this reduction in bulk was insufficient. Shortly afterwards Diogenian, a native of Heraclea in Pontus, produced another epitome in five books under the title λέξις παντοδαπή. He reduced the whole collection to alphabetical order and is the first author of a general lexicon which had the benefit of this arrangement[5]. The desired result was effected by the removal of most of the quotations,

Pamphilus.

Diogenian.

[1] For examples see the sources quoted for frs. 11, 36, 42, 59, 272, 425, 511, 619, 673, 885. Of course it is not pretended that strict proof is possible in each case.

[2] p. 164.

[3] Hence Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις in Athen. 494 F.

[4] According to the emendation of Naber (*Phot.* prol. p. 30), who gives Ν' for Δ' in Suid. *s.v.* Οὐηστῖνος.

[5] Reitzenstein in *Rh. Mus.* XLIII 456 ff. In this article the author divides the history of lexicography from the Alexandrians to Suidas into four periods. Pamphilus ends the first, Diogenian belongs to the second, and Hesychius to the third.

and by a severe restriction of the explanatory material. The work of Diogenian, notwithstanding these deficiences, proved adequate for its purpose. It was widely used as a handbook of reference so long as the classical authors continued to be read, and its existence can be traced in the Byzantine period down to the twelfth century[1]. So completely was Pamphilus superseded by the epitomator that Athenaeus and Herodian are almost the only writers who made use of the fuller collection. For us the παντοδαπὴ λέξις of Diogenian is especially of interest as the source from which Hesychius drew most of his material; for the weight of authority inclines strongly in favour of the identification with it of the περιεργοπένητες which Hesychius ascribes to Diogenian in the prefatory letter[2]. Thus Hesychius is the chief extant authority through which we can pass back to the τραγικὴ λέξις of Didymus, but the extent of the loss incurred in the epitomizing process can only be judged by the rare instances where a complete fragment of Didymus has been preserved[3]. Reference has already been made to the statement of Hesychius that Theon as well as Didymus was the author of lexicons to the tragic and comic poets. The conjecture of Naber[4] that Theon was the compiler, and that he put them together from the material scattered throughout the commentaries of Didymus, fails to account for the explicit references to the lexicons of Didymus. But Theon is of importance for other reasons. His services to Alexandrian literature were similar to those rendered by Didymus to the earlier poets: he is mentioned in the *subscriptio* as one of the sources for the existing scholia to Apollonius; and it is sufficiently established that he devoted considerable attention to the elucidation of Theocritus, Callimachus, and Lycophron, and published annotated editions of their poems[5]. Nevertheless, it has come as a surprise to find his name several times mentioned in the margin of the *Ichneutae*

Hesychius.

Theon.

[1] Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa v 781.

[2] Objections to the identification are stated by H. Schultz in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 1320. The strange title περιεργοπένητες is explained as 'the book for *poor pedants*.'

[3] *e.g.* the note on Achelous in Macrob. 5. 18.

[4] Phot. *lex.* I p. 9.

[5] Wilamowitz, *Textgesch. d. gr. Bukol.* p. 110; Schneider, *Callim.* II 37.

papyrus as authority for a variant adopted in his edition[1]. For there is no other evidence except the statement already quoted from Hesychius to connect Theon with the tragic poets[2], and the character of his edition and its relation to Didymus are equally obscure. It should be added that another grammarian, whose name may have been Nicanor, is quoted in the same papyrus but cannot be identified[3].

The second century A.D.

After the time of Didymus and Theon there is no further record of editions of the tragedians. In fact, after the lapse of a century, the need for such comprehensive studies in this branch of literature was rapidly disappearing. The age of Hadrian, so often celebrated as an era of renaissance in literary taste, was actually that in which the causes of ultimate decay begin to be visible. The days of creative genius were past. Literature had become self-conscious, and every literary aspirant, instead of seeking to express his own thoughts in his own way, made it his prime object to fashion his style according to the recognized classical models. Rhetorical sophistic, of which Aelius Aristides and the Philostrati are the most characteristic representatives, flourished exceedingly throughout the reigns of the Antonines. The vices of this literature were its artificiality, affectation, and excessive elaboration; its indifference to reality, and its hollowness; and its entire sacrifice of matter to form. Quintilian's maxim *pectus est quod disertos facit* was forgotten; and the researches of the Atticists from Aelius Dionysius to Phrynichus were directed primarily to the practical end of assisting the art of public speaking[4]. The last thing they had in view was a scientific study of the Attic dialect; and, besides the Attic orators, only those authors were cultivated whose vocabulary was adapted to rhetorical requirements. In these conditions, tragedy and lyric poetry were the first to suffer,—not that Sophocles and Pindar were dethroned from their high place, but

[1] Theon is, of course, a common name, so that some other critic than the son of Artemidorus may be intended.

[2] The references to his studies on Pindar are also rare: see schol. Pind. *Ol.* 5. 42. *Paean.* 2. 37.

[3] p. 224.

[4] 'Die grammatische arbeit des 2. jahrhunderts ist im grunde nichts als σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή': Wilamowitz, p. 176.

in a busy world they must submit to exercise their sway chiefly within the walls of the school-room. Hence arose the need for a selection, since the schoolmaster does not claim to be a scientific investigator who requires constant access to the whole of his material. There is thus good reason for the conclusion adopted by Wilamowitz that the selection of seven plays came into being during the course of the second century, although the name of the selector has not been recorded. It does not of course follow that the appearance of the selection led at once to the loss of the remaining plays. Copies of them were preserved in the public libraries, which might still have been consulted by professional students. We know also that the multiplication of transcripts on papyrus rolls still continued in Egypt[1], and no doubt elsewhere, so that readers must still have been forthcoming in certain circles. But, as demonstrating the loss of their influence on general culture, the subsequent absence of direct quotation is decisive.

§ 4. *The Sources of the Fragments.*

Now that we have followed the course of the tradition by which the plays of Sophocles were transmitted through Alexandria to the Roman and Byzantine eras, we are in a better position to examine the character of the documents in which the surviving fragments are preserved. These may be classified according to their origin as follows: (1) fragments of Sophoclean papyri; (2) direct quotations; and (3) indirect quotations. The third class, which is by far the most numerous, includes every case in which the author of the extant source owes his information not directly to Sophocles, but to some intermediate writer.

Papyrus fragments.

The papyrus fragments are very few in number, and, except those belonging to the *Eurypylus* and *Ichneutae*, not of much intrinsic importance. Still, the lines recovered from the Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος have settled the vexed question relating to the plot of

[1] See below. The parchment fragment of the *Melanippe* of Euripides (fr. 495) is now assigned to the fifth century: but that is an exceptional case. To the same effect Wilamowitz, *Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 288.

that play[1]; the scanty relics of the *Niobe* have some bearing on Sophocles' handling of the story[2]; and the fragments provisionally assigned to the *Tantalus* in this edition, if they are the work of Sophocles at all, raise a question of considerable interest[3]. All these, except the *Niobe* fragments, which are attributed to the third century B.C., are believed to have been written in the second century A.D., so that their date is entirely consistent with the conclusion reached in the last section[4].

It is a more difficult matter to decide which are the latest direct quotations from the lost plays, because we cannot always be certain whether a reference which purports to come direct from Sophocles has not in fact been borrowed from an earlier authority whose existence is not acknowledged in the source. To take a capital instance, no one now believes that the swarms of quotations with which Clement of Alexandria fills certain portions of his writings were due to his immediate acquaintance with the text of the authors cited. We shall subsequently explain how he came by them.

Direct quotations.

The sources which beyond all dispute show a first-hand acquaintance with the text of Sophocles are a small proportion of the total. Of those which are altogether or almost contemporary the most numerous and important are the plays of the comic poets. Aristophanes refers to the *Niobe* by name and to the *Tereus* and *Tyro* in unmistakable terms[5]; and at least sixteen other allusions to or parodies of the Sophoclean text are warranted by the evidence of the scholia[6]. It is curious that five of them belong to the *Peleus*, a play not otherwise much quoted; and one of the same group is further echoed by a comic writer, who may have been Aristophanes himself, and was at any rate his contemporary[7]. The Old Comedy is also represented by single quotations of Philonides, Eupolis, and Phrynichus[8], and

[1] I p. 94 ff. [2] II p. 96 f.

[3] II pp. 97 f., 209 ff.

[4] The papyrus of the *Hypsipyle* (Oxyrh. Pap. no. 852) is considered to be not much, if at all, anterior to 200 A.D.

[5] Ar. *Vesp.* 579, *Av.* 100, *Lys.* 138.

[6] frs. 178, 275, 371, 469, 476, 487, 489, 490, 491, 493, 578, 654, 668, 683 (doubtful), 710, 727, 890.

[7] See n. on fr. 487. [8] frs. 491, 811, 890.

the Middle by an interesting parody of Antiphanes[1]. At a later date Menander copied a famous trimeter which was in everyone's mouth[2]; and another imitation of the same line appears in the collection of *monosticha* which passes by the same writer's name. This miscellany, which was not put together until Roman times, while containing much that Menander certainly did not write, includes a number of lines which appear to follow the tracks of Sophocles. Here or there may be an instance where Menander deliberately repeated a tragic verse; but most of them, whether transmitted through his agency or that of others, had become current as *publica materies*, having long ceased to be recognized as subject to the private dominion of Sophocles[3].

We pass to the prose-writers of the fourth century. Two allusions to Sophoclean fragments have been traced in the dialogues of Plato, but neither is free from doubt[4]. On the other hand, by a curious error, which he shared with Aristophanes and Antisthenes, he attributed to Euripides a line which certainly belonged to the *Locrian Ajax*[5]. Demosthenes in a well-known passage mentions the appearance of Aeschines in the title-rôle of the *Oenomaus*. Aristotle in the *poetics* refers to the *Eurypylus*, *Lacaenae*, *Niptra*, *Peleus*, *Phthiotides*, *Tereus*, and *Tyro*, and perhaps to the *Polyxena*; while in the *rhetoric* he cites the Σύνδειπνοι, *Teucer*, and *Tyro*[6]. Reasons have also been given for supposing that he has wrongly ascribed to Aeschylus a fragment of considerable length which actually came from the *Tereus*[7]. The plot of the *Aleadae* was detected by means of indications afforded in the *Odysseus* attributed to Alcidamas.

[1] fr. 754.

[2] fr. 319. It should be added that the alleged quotations by Aristophon (fr. 198), Alexis (fr. 895), and Philemon (fr. 918), are extremely doubtful.

[3] Similarly the Greek original which no doubt lies at the back of Plaut. *Stich.* 522 cannot be proved to have been imitated from fr. 88, 1.

[4] frs. 256, 662.

[5] See n. on fr. 14. Attention should have been directed to the significant statement in the Aristophanic scholia, that the play of Euripides in which the words occurred was not preserved.

[6] Here, and generally throughout the present section, the reader is referred to Nauck's Index of Sources for the verification of statements not otherwise vouched.

[7] See on fr. 581.

This work is a sophistic exercise of uncertain date; but, even if not composed within the limits of the fourth century, it cannot be placed much later[1].

There is not much to be said of the literature of the following centuries until we reach the Roman age, since the learning of Alexandria is known to us almost entirely at second hand. An exception should perhaps be made in favour of the καταστερισμοί of Eratosthenes, in which the various constellations are enumerated in connexion with a series of poetical legends. The epitome which has come down to us is a miserably distorted copy of its original, but the trend of recent criticism favours the view that some such treatise was actually written by Erastosthenes, and that a residuum of his learning is to be found in the existing text[2]. In that case the information respecting the plot of the *Andromeda*[3] comes direct from a handbook of the third century B.C. The fragments of a description of Greece wrongly attributed to Dicaearchus yield a single quotation from Sophocles[4]. These interesting extracts have now been identified as the work of Heracleides ὁ κριτικός, whose name has been recovered from a quotation by Apollonius, the collector of παράδοξα[5]. Nothing further is known of the author, and the composition of his book has been variously dated between the limits 289—171 B.C.[6] Polybius, who makes a vague allusion to the *Antenoridae*[7], stands on the threshold of the Roman epoch. Roman period.

In an examination of the Greek and Roman literature of the two centuries which respectively precede and follow the opening of the Christian era, there is no longer a presumption in favour of the immediate derivation of a quotation from its source. Literary production had become a well-organized profession with specialized branches. There was a vigorous demand for handbooks of all kinds, in the interest of a cosmopolitan culture thereby the more easily attained. Philosophy, science, and the Indirect quotations.

[1] Blass, *Attische Beredsamkeit*, II² p. 363.

[2] A summary of the controversy is given by Knaack in his article on Eratosthenes in Pauly-Wissowa VI 377 ff.

[3] I p. 78. [4] fr. 773. [5] *hist. mir.* 19 (Westermann, p. 109).

[6] See Daebritz in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 484 ff., and W. H. Duke in *Essays presented to Ridgeway*, p. 328 ff. [7] I p. 88.

art of rhetoric must be distilled to serve the needs of the less robust intelligences. In addition to the stimulus imparted by the requirements of the higher education, there arose a spirit of general curiosity in polite circles, which contributed towards the literary splendours of the Augustan age. Such considerations will explain that, where dependence upon authority was universal, its frequent acknowledgement became tedious and unnecessary: a reference or allusion might be borrowed without any sacrifice of literary candour. But the character of the witness is a most material factor in the valuation of the record, and it is also essential to remember the particular object which he had in view. At first sight there is no reason to suspect that Ovid's reference to the Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταί[1], and Horace's to the *Peleus*[2], were not inspired by their familiarity with the texts of the Greek tragedians. But we cannot so conclude with any certainty: there is abundant evidence of Ovid's dependence on the mythographical tradition, and the *Ars Poetica* is known to have been based upon the treatise of Neoptolemus of Parium[3]. A specimen of the manuals available for the use of the Augustan poets is preserved in the booklet of Parthenius of Nicaea περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων. As its title indicates, this was a collection of love-stories with unhappy endings, each of which is prefaced with a statement of the literary authority or authorities responsible for the form of the narrative adopted[4]. The work was dedicated to Cornelius Gallus, the elegiac poet, and was written expressly for the purpose of assisting his memory, if he chose to employ the material in future poems. The *Euryalus* of Sophocles[5] is quoted as sole authority for the tale of Odysseus' love for Euippe and its fatal issue, and to Parthenius, if not to Gallus, the play was probably familiar. Cicero stands on a different footing to most of our informants; for he has admitted us to the secrets of his workshop. Cicero was undoubtedly a

Cicero and the philosophers.

[1] I p. 104. [2] *A. P.* 96.

[3] Meineke, *Anal. Alex.* p. 360. Catull. 70. 3 refers rather to a familiar proverb than to the text of Sophocles (fr. 811).

[4] Hercher in *Herm.* XII 306 ff. contended that the names were a later addition, but their trustworthiness in general was maintained by Bethe (*ib.* XXXVIII 608 ff.). It is possible that they were taken from Pamphilus' Λειμών.

[5] I p. 145.

student of the text of Sophocles. In this connexion the allusions to the Latin versions of the *Erigone*[1] and the Σύνδειπνοι[2] which Quintus sent to his brother from Gaul are more significant than the casual quotations in the letters to Atticus[3]. But when he compares the treatment by Pacuvius and Sophocles of the scene where the wounded Ulysses is carried home to die[4], when he recalls the line of the *Epigoni* with which Cleanthes rebuked the apostate Dionysius[5], and when he offers a Latin rendering of the speech in the *Teucer* moralizing on the hypocrisies of consolation[6], it is not difficult to guess that the references to Sophocles were suggested to him by the Greek originals from which he put together the *Tusculan disputations*. In the post-Aristotelian schools there had arisen a custom which, if not originated by Chrysippus, found in him its chief representative,—that of enveloping their arguments with a cloud of poetic witnesses. To this custom we owe the quotations and allusions of Philodemus the Epicurean, even if he did not borrow all of them from an earlier source. No such hesitation is necessary in regard to Seneca[7], whose *naturales quaestiones* were largely drawn from Posidonius through the medium of Asclepiodotus. The name of Philo of Alexandria (*c.* 39 A.D.) occurs only twice in the list of sources[8]: in one case it is not certain that he is referring to Sophocles at all; in the other the Stoic colour of the context is so clearly manifest that the origin of the quotation is scarcely doubtful.

Writers on rhetoric.

The writers on the art of rhetoric are open to a similar suspicion,—that of having borrowed from their Peripatetic predecessors. Demetrius in his *de elocutione*,—a treatise whose authorship and date are both uncertain, but which recent critics put somewhere within the limits 100 B.C. and 100 A.D.,—quotes fr. 611 on the authority of Theophrastus[9], just as he takes Eur.

[1] I p. 173. [2] II p. 201. [3] frs. 636, 662, 768.
[4] *Tusc.* 2. 48–50. [5] *Tusc.* 2. 60. [6] fr. 576.
[7] fr. 882. Laurentius Lydus derives from Seneca. For the history of the doxographical tradition concerning the causes of the summer rising of the Nile see Diels, *Dox. Gr.* p. 226 ff. The scholia to Apollonius Rhodius are, of course, not independent.—It would be rash to assume that Seneca translated fr. 665 in the *Hercules Oetaeus*.
[8] frs. 755, 943. [9] fr. 94 Wimmer.

fr. 515 from Praxiphanes. No such declared source is forthcoming for the allusions of the author of the *de sublimitate* or of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the *de compositione verborum*[1]. The miscellaneous learning recorded by the last-named author in the first book of the *Antiquitates Romanae*, in connexion with the Oenotrians, the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians, and the flight of Aeneas from Troy, was collected in part at any rate by Varro[2]. The book *περὶ τρόπων*, which passes for the work of Tryphon, is a garbled extract from the grammarian who was a younger contemporary of Didymus[3].

Strabo.

Strabo (*c.* 63 B.C.—23 A.D.) owed his geographical information more largely to books than to the records of his own observation. His two chief sources were Artemidorus of Ephesus[4] (*c.* 100 B.C.), the writer of a periplus of the Mediterranean Sea in eleven books, who in his turn compiled from Agatharchides, Timosthenes, Eratosthenes, and others, and Apollodorus of Athens, whose commentary on the Homeric catalogue of ships was not the least remarkable of his critical labours[5]. Thus at least six of the fragments preserved in Strabo may be referred to the authority of Apollodorus[6]; one at least appears to go back to Eratosthenes[7]; and Demetrius of Scepsis (*c.* 150 B.C.), whose work on the Trojan catalogue (Hom. B 816—877) was used by Strabo as well as the better-known treatise of Apollodorus, has been identified as the original source of the

[1] frs. 768, 774. See also Introductory Note to the *Polyxena* (II p. 162). The work of pseudo-Longinus is now with general consent assigned to the first century A.D. The later rhetoricians contribute little. Hermogenes (b. 160 A.D.) probably took his illustration *φίλανδρος* (fr. 1111) from an earlier *τέχνη*; Menander (*c.* 270 A.D.) introduces Sophocles into a discussion of hymns called *διαπορητικοί* (fr. 809); and Phoebammon, a contemporary of Synesius, repeats a familiar example of epanalepsis (fr. 753), which recurs in John of Sicily (11th cent., according to Krumbacher, p. 191).

[2] frs. 598, 270, 373. Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 306$_{14}$. The appearance of fr. 270, 4 in schol. Ap. Rhod. is significant.

[3] See frs. 487, 963. Cocondrius and Polybius of Sardis of course followed the rhetorical tradition. Suid. *s.v.* Τρύφων assigns the rhetorical book to the grammarian.

[4] Susemihl, I 695.

[5] For the particular sections of Strabo attributable to Apollodorus see E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa I 2867–2870.

[6] frs. 24, 411, 522, 957, 1086, 1110.

[7] fr. 959. The reference to the *Triptolemus* (II p. 243) is also derived ultimately from Eratosthenes.

curious information relating to the Idaean Dactyls[1]. The *naturalis historia* of the elder Pliny (23—69 A.D.) is a work which to an even greater extent was made up of excerpts taken from previous authors. No fewer than 146 Roman and 327 foreign writers were utilized for the purpose; and so little was Pliny disposed to conceal his obligations that he prefixed to each book a list of the chief authorities upon which it depended. Of the fragments which he cites from Sophocles[2] the first is inserted in the course of a passage borrowed from Theophrastus, and the manner of its introduction shows that Pliny had access to the tradition of the *didascaliae*; the second is a botanical memorandum, which came immediately from Sextius Niger, but may have been drawn ultimately from the ῥιζοτομικόν of Diocles of Carystus, a distinguished physician contemporary with Plato. Dion of Prusa in Bithynia, or Dion Chrysostom, as he is usually styled, belongs to the end of the period now under discussion. His devotion to the study of the great Attic tragedians is attested by his well-known essay on the treatment of the story of Philoctetes by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides respectively[3]. We should not, therefore, expect him to quote at second hand; but his testimony consists only of an allusion to the *Thyestes*[4], with perhaps another to an important fragment of the *Aleadae*[5]. Last of all comes Plutarch (46—120 A.D.), one of our most valuable sources, whose quotations are those of a first-rate artist steeped in the knowledge of his native literature. Although he sometimes quoted from memory, particularly if the line had become somewhat hackneyed[6], it is scarcely doubtful that in most cases he drew from the originals. The occasional coincidences with Stobaeus and Clement[7] are probably accidental, and are anyhow quite insufficient to prove that Plutarch habitually made use of an anthology. Here and there he repeats a quotation which he must have found in his

The elder Pliny.

Dion Chrysostom.

Plutarch.

[1] E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa IV 2809. Otherwise Bethe in *Herm.* XXIV 411.

[2] frs. 600, 830. Cf. II p. 66. A particularly interesting example, which shows conclusively the second-hand character of Pliny's information, is referred to by Jebb on *O. T.* p. 232.

[3] Or. 52 (II 104 Arn.). For a description see Jebb's *Philoctetes*, p. XVI.

[4] I p. 92. [5] fr. 88. [6] frs. 662, 776, 840.

[7] For examples see frs. 81, 88, 636, 770, 771, 929.

source. Fr. 873 is a clear instance, made more conspicuous by the repetition of Dio Cassius and Appian; and one may suspect that in some of the ethical treatises, such as the *περὶ τύχης* and the *περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας*, which by their style betray the influence of the philosophical schools, the quotations were taken over together with the text which they served to illustrate[1]. It is probable also that in the book *πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιημάτων ἀκούειν* Plutarch borrowed extensively from a work of Chrysippus similarly entitled[2], although the limits of his obligation cannot be accurately fixed.

Atticism.

The second century A.D. owes such importance as it possesses in the history of Greek literature in large measure to the classical revival known as Atticism. It was, as has been already pointed out, the product of an age to which substance had become less essential than style, and whose study of the ancient classics was limited by the practical object of fostering rhetorical ability. We shall presently describe the efforts of the lexicographers to provide the studious with the necessary material for the cultivation of purity of diction; the general literature, if we include under this term the representative sophists, is of minor importance for the present purpose, and will not detain us long. The most famous names of the Hellenic renaissance which started in the reign of Hadrian, and lasted for more than a century, are Lucian, Aristides, and the Philostrati. Lucian refers to the *Locrian Ajax*[3], perhaps also to the *Cedalion*[4], and quotes a fragment from the *Meleager* without naming the play[5]. Aelius Aristides shows his acquaintance with the text of the *Ἑλένης γάμος*[6], and compares the treacherous beacon of Nauplius with the work of incendiaries at Eleusis[7]. The Philostrati scarcely

[1] The remark applies to frs. 373, 843, 844. It should be observed that the reference to *ἦθος* as *πηγή*, which almost immediately precedes the quotation of fr. 373, was borrowed from Zeno (1 203 Arn., fr. 146 P.). The difficulties which Plutarch's text involves (see note *in loc.*) are perhaps the result of a confused epitome.

[2] II p. 202 Arn.

[3] I p. 10.

[4] II p. 9.

[5] fr. 401.

[6] I p. 126. Phot. *bibl.* p. 438[a] 6, and Choric. *pro mimis* 6. 27 (*Revue de Philol.* 1 222), follow Aristides. For fr. 756 see note *in loc.* The repetition of two familiar tags (frs. 14, 733) is unimportant.

[7] fr. 435.

come into the account. Philostratus the Athenian quotes only from the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Oedipus Coloneus*, and *Antigone*, in the *Life of Apollonius*, and from the *Electra* in the *Lives of the sophists*,—sufficient evidence surely that in his day these plays had a certain degree of celebrity above their fellows. In the *heroicus* and *imagines*, which are ascribed to his kinsman and contemporary known as Philostratus the Lemnian[1], there may be many reminiscences of tragedy, such as the passage quoted by Nauck in illustration of the discoveries of Palamedes[2]; but they are seldom acknowledged, and have in consequence generally ceased to be traceable. The *imagines* of the younger Philostratus, who describes himself as grandson of the Lemnian on the mother's side, are separated by an interval of seventy or more years from the publication of the earlier series. He quotes the *Oedipus Coloneus* and the *Philoctetes*, and his allusion to Sophocles' description of Scyros as wind-swept[3], and his description of the meeting of Phoenix with Neoptolemus, suggest that he was acquainted with the *Scyrians*. But the general character of his work, apart altogether from his date, makes the inference extremely questionable[4]. Aelian, who survived the death of Caracalla (222 A.D.), was a contemporary of Philostratus the Athenian. Though in intention a stylist, being at the same time an industrious collector of unconsidered trifles, he reflects the preference of his age for spurious learning to independent research. The fragments resting on his authority are taken from the *de natura animalium*, and were derived by Aelian through his source Alexander of Myndos (before 50 A.D.) from Aristophanes of Byzantium and others of the Alexandrian school[5]. From Aelian we pass to Athenaeus, an important witness, to whom we owe more than sixty quotations. The investigation of the sources from which Athenaeus drew his

Aelian.

Athenaeus.

[1] On the Philostrati see J. S. Phillimore's *Philostratus*, I pp. xxxiv–xlv. A different distribution of the extant works is recommended by Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* II[5] p. 608 ff.

[2] See on fr. 432. 2. [3] fr. 553.

[4] Wilamowitz, *Einleitung in d. gr. Tr.* p. 201.

[5] See especially *nat. an.* 7. 39 *ad fin.* The reference to Aristotle (*ibid.* 11. 18) points in the same direction, since Alexander's chief source was Aristophanes' *epitome* of Aristotle's zoological teaching.

abundant supply of quotations is rendered unusually difficult by the fact that the *Deipnosophists* has come down to us in an abbreviated form, and by the tendency of its author to interrupt the course of a borrowed extract with material which he had gathered elsewhere[1]. It is admitted that he was not merely a compiler. He had studied widely in the ancient texts for the purpose of illustrating his various topics, and a considerable proportion of the numerous passages taken from the plays of the comic poets was undoubtedly due to his own researches. Tragedy was less likely to provide him with material; and he was content to accept its evidence at second hand. At any rate, a careful scrutiny into the character of his quotations from Sophocles will confirm the judgement pronounced by Wilamowitz[2] that not a single tragedy was quoted directly. Although the nature of Athenaeus' book, even apart from its tradition, is such as unduly to favour the impression that it largely consists of glosses unskilfully strung together, we shall hardly err in concluding that many of the Sophoclean fragments were derived from the lexicographers. That the glosses were taken from a lexicon is sometimes betrayed by their alphabetical order, as may be seen from the list of cups given in the eleventh book, where the name of Pamphilus occurs several times. It has already been mentioned that Pamphilus, who was perhaps the chief lexicographical authority of Athenaeus, had incorporated the results of Didymus' τραγικαὶ λέξεις. Athenaeus often discloses the name of his authority,—the ultimate, it may be, rather than the immediate source. Thus, fr. 718 was derived from the commentary of Didymus, fr. 324 from Speusippus περὶ ὁμοίων[3], fr. 28 from Cephisodorus the pupil of Isocrates, fr. 111 from Tryphon[4], and fr. 12 from Aristoxenus' Life of Archytas. In

[1] Clear instances of such interruption will be found in the quotations relating to the polypus and the μάνης inserted at 513 C and 487 D respectively.

[2] *op. cit.* p. 176.

[3] This was a survey and classification of natural history. See Zeller's *Plato and the older Academy*, p. 567[28] E. tr.

[4] The statement suggests that he was also the source of frs. 137 and 230.—In regard to fr. 606 a neat point arises which is not without a bearing on the criticism of the text. It is clear that Athenaeus and Pollux both used the same source; and, apart from the evidence of the *Philetaerus* (of which more presently), περὶ μον. λέξ.

other cases the source may be identified by inference or probable conjecture. Thus fr. 502 is shown to have been derived from Apollodorus *περὶ ἑταιρῶν* by its recurrence in Harpocration, fr. 448 may be referred to Chamaeleon[1], fr. 765 to Satyrus or Hermippus, fr. 121 to Clearchus *περὶ γρίφων*, fr. 474 to the same writer's *ἐρωτικά*, fr. 307 to his *περὶ παροιμιῶν*[2], and fr. 735 to Theophrastus *περὶ μέθης*. Sometimes the ownership of the borrowed material is no longer traceable[3], or the quotation bears the appearance of having been made independently for the position which it occupies[4]. But an example will show that appearances are not always to be trusted. In the course of a discussion on the use of *μύρον* and its effect upon the senses, Athenaeus interpolates as a reason for anointing the breast the statement that the vital principle (*ψυχή*) is situated in the heart[5], and appeals to the testimony of Soph. fr. 766 amongst other poetical authorities. The names of two physicians Praxagoras and Phylotimus are mentioned as holding the same opinion, and at first sight it might be inferred that Athenaeus either took his quotations from one or the other of them, or collected them himself in corroboration of their view. But the dogma that the principate (*ἡγεμονικόν*) of the soul, that is to say, the mind, resides in the heart was strenuously maintained by the Stoic school, and Chrysippus supported it by thousands of

p. 35. 19, quoting Aesch. fr. 211, suggests that this was Herodian. But there are good reasons for believing that Athenaeus did not use Herodian: see Kaibel on 52 D. The common source must therefore be earlier than his time, and we shall find subsequently that this conclusion may be recommended on other grounds.

[1] fr. 345, which relates to the same subject, occurs in the neighbourhood of two other quotations which are repeated in Plut. *amat.* 5 p. 751 C. It may be inferred that Plutarch and Athenaeus were indebted to the same original. Plutarch then proceeds to quote Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 42, and illustrates it by the same fragment of Sappho (fr. 34) which is adduced by Pindar's scholiast.

[2] Cf. 317 A.

[3] frs. 760 and 761 come from a rhetorical discussion of *μεταφορά* after Arist. *rhet.* 3. 10. 1411[a] 1 ff., fr. 378 from some writer of *συμποσιακά*, frs. 277 and 537 from a dissertation on the game cottabus, frs. 239, 241, and 412 perhaps from the *θεατρικὴ ἱστορία* of Juba (*FHG* III 481).

[4] The remark applies especially to such cases as frs. 329, 563, and 757, or Eur. fr. 899, where the quotations belong to the framework of the dialogue.

[5] See 687 E.

quotations from the poets[1]. Here then is enough to awaken suspicion. Now, a good deal of Chrysippus περὶ ψυχῆς has been preserved by Galen, and our suspicion is confirmed when we find that the two separate lines which Athenaeus quotes from the *Odyssey* appear at the head of the list of Homeric quotations which Galen repeats after Chrysippus[2]. If any doubt remains concerning the source of Athenaeus, it is dissipated by the further discovery that Chrysippus appealed to the authority of Praxagoras in opposition to those medical writers who made the head the centre of the nervous system[3].

Scientific and technical writers.

The scientific and departmental writers who flourished in the second and early part of the third century shared the general failure of independence which characterized their epoch, and their show of learning is even less to be credited when it falls outside their proper sphere. It is a rare exception when Aulus Gellius testifies to his personal acquaintance with the text of the *Locrian Ajax*[4]. Galen professedly owed his poetical illustrations of the word πέμφιγξ to the γραμματικοί[5], from whom also Sextus Empiricus quoted the Phrygian βαλλήν[6]. The same source may be confidently assumed for Rufus Ephesius, the writer on anatomy, from his agreement with Hesychius and the scholiast on Aristophanes[7]. Achilles, the commentator on Aratus, drew his material from Posidonius through Diodorus of Alexandria[8]. Diogenes Laertius quotes two of the fragments[9]: one of these he derived from Antigonus of Carystus[10] (third

[1] E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, p. 24538.

[2] Galen *Hipp. et Plat. plac.* 3. 2 p. 260 M. (II 906 Arn.). From *ib.* 3. 4 p. 281 M. (II 907 Arn.) we learn that tragic quotations were included in the collection.

[3] Galen *ib.* 1. 7 p. 145 M. (II 897 Arn.).

[4] fr. 14. Cf. fr. 695. He states that he heard Peregrinus quote fr. 307.

[5] frs. 337, 338, 538, 539. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 176. Note the coincidence with Photius in regard to Aesch. fr. 170.

[6] fr. 515.

[7] fr. 596.

[8] frs. 432, 737, 738. With him goes the anonymous writer who quotes fr. 752. In regard to all this class of literature I transcribe the caustic judgement of Diels (*Doxogr.* p. 19): 'scilicet tum ea ars, quae vetera furando nova scripta gignebat non inventa quidem, sed consummata esse videtur. neque frustra Clemens Alexandrinus ipse fur callidissimus furtorum catalogum congessit sive potius et ipsum descripsit Strom. VI 2.'

[9] frs. 477, 873.

[10] Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, p. 74.

century B.C.) and the other from Diocles of Magnesia (b. 80—70 B.C.). Artemidorus, who wrote on the interpretation of dreams, cites fr. 860 without the author's name and obviously at second hand[1]. Porphyrius (233—304 A.D.) quotes fr. 398 in the *de abstinentia*, fr. 879 in the *de antro nympharum*, and fr. 108 in the *quaestiones Homericae*. As a Homeric critic he was of course familiar with grammatical learning, and, though he was skilful enough to present the appearance of an independent writer, Bernays showed that the *de abstinentia* was largely composed of extracts from Theophrastus *περὶ εὐσεβείας*[2]. Hyginus the mythographer is of importance rather in relation to the plots of the lost plays than as a witness to the fragments. The date of the handbook can only be determined in so far as it was certainly written before 207 A.D., when it was translated into Greek[3]; but the scholarship of its author may be gauged by his description of Melanippe as daughter of Desmon, no doubt after the Euripidean title *Μελανίππη ἡ δεσμῶτις*[4]. It is beyond question that he derives from a Greek original belonging to the same stream of tradition as that which pseudo-Apollodorus followed[5]. The sources of the second book of the *poetica astronomia*, another work passing by the name of Hyginus, have been examined by Robert[6]: it is sufficient to say that the chief authority used was the *καταστερισμοί* of Eratosthenes, but that traces are also to be found of Parmeniscus, Asclepiades of Tragilus, and some others. Servius, the Vergilian commentator, refers to the *Laocoon* of Sophocles[7] for a mythological detail which no one supposes that he had learnt by an inspection of the original; but from what source he derived this and his veiled allusion to the *Lacaenae*[8] we are not in a position to determine.

[1] For the work of Artemidorus see Susemihl, I 868.

[2] J. Bernays, *Theophrasts Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, Berlin, 1866. He has, however, demonstrated that the passage in which the Sophoclean extract occurs is actually an inset made in accordance with the plan acknowledged by Porphyrius at the end of c. 33, and interrupting the course of the argument. He identifies the grammarian (p. 71) from whom Porphyrius got the quotations with Aristomenes, who was a freedman of Hadrian, and whose *τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἱερουργίας* is quoted by Athen. 115 A.

[3] See M. Schmidt's edition at p. LIV. [4] *Fab.* 186.

[5] For the earliest mythographical handbook see Susemihl, II 50 and *infr.* p. XXVI.

[6] *Eratosthenis catasterismorum reliquiae*, Berlin, 1878.

[7] fr. 372. [8] fr. 367. Hyginus and Varro were among his sources.

The interpretation of Vergil gives Macrobius occasion to cite a remarkable fragment[1] from the Ῥιζοτόμοι of Sophocles, which he supposes Vergil to have copied; but it is impossible to allow Macrobius himself the credit of making the comparison. The same writer reproduces the whole of Athenaeus' note on *καρχήσιον*, and, as included in it, the quotation of fr. 660.

Fourth and fifth centuries A.D.

The names of Servius and Macrobius have been introduced by anticipation. Though neither of them wrote in Greek, they are both representative of the last stage of the common Graeco-Roman culture which immediately preceded the centuries of Byzantine decadence. In its various branches Nonnus, Libanius, Heliodorus, and Proclus were the chief pillars of the dying Greek literature. But, except in the mechanical repetitions of successive generations of grammarians and lexicographers, or in the traditional quotation of a stock passage by sophists and rhetoricians[2], the memory of Attic tragedy was almost entirely extinct. The partisans of Hellenism were fighting in a losing cause, and the efforts of the best of them, praiseworthy as they are, show how narrow and superficial was their acquaintance with the works of the ancient masters. Julian never quotes Sophocles by name, and none of the fragments so far as we know has the support of his authority[3]. It would be too much to assert that he was not acquainted with a single one of the plays; for phrases occur which are reasonably regarded as echoes of the *Antigone* and the *Philoctetes*[4]. But Homer and Plato, the

[1] fr. 534. It is clear that he followed one of the ancient commentators on Vergil both here and in his comparison of *Aen.* 4. 698 with Eur. *Alc.* 73. See Nettleship in Conington's *Vergil*, I[4] p. XLVIII f. These Vergilian scholia, as well as those on Lucan and Statius, go back to Greek sources (Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 167). The point illustrated by Macrobius is the ritual sanctity of brass, and Sophocles is the only Greek author cited.

[2] Such is the quotation of fr. 940 by Gregory of Nazianzus. Echoes of frs. 662 and 929 are found in Nicephorus Gregoras and Ioannes Chumnos, who lived as late as the fourteenth century. A familiar instance is the wearisome recurrence of Eur. fr. 484, 1 *οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος ἀλλά*...in Julian and others. Fr. 14 is quoted both by Libanius and Themistius.

[3] The passage quoted by Nauck on fr. 811 is obviously not an allusion (except indirectly) to Sophocles.

[4] 132 C *ἀκτὶς ἀελίου* (*Ant.* 100); 447 B *τὸν φίλτατον, ὡς φής, ἀνέμων* (*Phil.* 273). Sandys, *Hist. Cl. Schol.* I p. 359, infers from the fact that *O. T.* 614 is followed (338 C)

study of whose writings was kept alive by the lectures of the Neoplatonists, are the only ancient authors to whom he freely refers[1]. Libanius (314—393 A.D.), the foremost man of letters of his age, is hardly in a better case than his imperial patron, although his reading was naturally wider[2]. It is true that his acquaintance with Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides is vouched on the authority of his latest editor[3]; but it is not evident that this implies a wider knowledge of their text than is open to a scholar of the present day. His reference to the *Tereus* (II p. 224) does not prove that he knew the play, and his allusion to the ill treatment of Minos on the stage was derived from Plutarch or the pseudo-Platonic *Minos*[4]. Though Libanius is our sole authority for fr. 808, the sentiment there expressed is of a familiar currency; and the appearance of two parallel passages from Euripides[5] in the immediate context suggests that all three were borrowed from an anthology. Nor is the character of his other references to tragic fragments such as to inspire confidence in the extent of his knowledge[6]. Synesius, who was born a few years after the death of Julian and survived Libanius by some twenty years, is one of the most attractive figures of his age. He is the last representative of the genuine Hellenic spirit, never ceasing to urge upon his hearers the importance of literary and philosophical studies[7]. But his own knowledge was neither deep nor wide, and the preponderating influence of Homer and Plato is even more clearly marked than

by the words *ὡς παρὰ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἔγνωμεν*, that the name of the author was unknown, and that Sophocles was evidently no longer read. His quotations from Eur. (see *e.g.* 445 B) are confined to the *Bacchae*, *Phoenissae*, and *Orestes*.

[1] He had also studied Aristotle and Theophrastus: Sandys, p. 357.

[2] Themistius (IV 71) mentions Thuc., Isocr., Dem., Plat., and Arist., as the five classics chiefly studied at Constantinople, and elsewhere (XXIII 350) adds Aristophanes as a sixth. Libanius (III. 438) speaks vaguely of his readings in the poets.

[3] R. Foerster in *Rh. Mus.* XXXII 87. Unger cleverly emended *ep.* 1398 from Eur. *I.A.* 128.

[4] [Plat.] *Min.* 318 E, 321 A; Plut. *Thes.* 16; Liban. III 64. It is highly probable that the *Camici* (II p. 3) was one of the plays illustrating the tragic conception of Minos as an overbearing and cruel tyrant.

[5] *Hec.* 596, *Or.* 126.

[6] Aesch. fr. 340 and Eur. fr. 934 are among the more favourable examples.

[7] R. Volkmann, *Synesios*, pp. 134—136.

in Julian[1]. He can hardly be cited as a witness for fr. 948, and a vague reference to *Ai.* 1146[2] is almost the only indication of an acquaintance with Sophocles.

Scholia.

The immediate sources of the greater number of the fragments are the collections of scholia, the Byzantine lexicons, and the anthology of Stobaeus. The most important of the scholia are found in the MSS of the three tragedians, Aristophanes, Homer, Pindar, Plato, and the Alexandrian poets. The labours of Didymus in relation to Sophocles and Euripides have already been mentioned, and his services to Aeschylus, although less clearly attested, are believed to have been of a similar character[3]. The remaining scholia, so far as they concern us here, will next be briefly described.

Aristophanic scholia.

The scholia of Aristophanes, although for obvious reasons their evidence more often touches Euripides, are nevertheless, as we have seen[4], of considerable importance for Sophocles. The citations from ancient poets were due almost entirely to Didymus[5], who here as elsewhere drew upon the learning of his predecessors. The extent of his influence is not to be measured, except in comparison with others, by the sixty-four explicit references to his name[6]. Phaeinus and Symmachus, who are mentioned in the *subscriptio* of the Venetus to the *Nubes* and to the *Pax*, have been identified as the immediate sources of the extant collection. Symmachus, whose name occurs some forty times in the scholia, was an Alexandrian who lived about a century after Didymus, and shows himself to be capable of exercising an independent judgement[7]. Phaeinus, by some regarded as an early Byzantine, is of no importance except as

[1] W. S. Crawford, *Synesius the Hellene*, 1901, has a useful list (pp 522—579) of the literary quotations in Synesius. It must, however, be used with caution.

[2] Quoted by Jebb, *in loc.* For references to Euripides, such as they are, see frs. 300, 723.

[3] Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa V 451.

[4] p. xlvii.

[5] His commentary is mentioned by Athen. 67 D *Δίδυμος δ' ἐξηγούμενος τὸ ἰαμβεῖον* (Plut. 720) *κτέ.* A good account of it is given by Cohn, *l.c.* 455.

[6] No less than thirty-three are in the scholia to the *Aves*.

[7] Wilamowitz treats Symmachus as the first compiler of our collection of scholia. Williams White, however, as we have already seen (p. xlii), holding that such collections were not anterior to the age of the parchment book, takes a somewhat different view of the activities of Symmachus.

a compiler, and may have been responsible for the inclusion of the colometry of Heliodorus, and of extracts from Herodian and other authorities later than Symmachus.

Pindaric scholia.

We owe twenty-two valuable quotations to the scholia on Pindar. These may be assigned without hesitation to Didymus, who was responsible for practically the whole of the learned material preserved in these commentaries[1]. Our collection goes back to an edition of the *Epinicia* in the second century A.D., which repeated the substance of Didymus' work without adding much of importance. The date is approximately fixed by a quotation from Amyntianus[2], a writer who dedicated his history of Alexander the Great to the emperor Marcus. In two instances at least we are able to go beyond Didymus: the illustration of *τῶν τριῶν ἕν*[3] was taken from the *περὶ παροιμιῶν* of Aristides of Miletus, which is dated in the second half of the second century B.C.[4], and the proverb *ἀφ' ἑστίας ἄρχεσθαι* was discussed by Aristocritus, who belonged to the same period[5].

Platonic scholia.

The minute study of the Platonic dialogues was not seriously undertaken before the age of the Roman empire, and received its chief impulse from the Neoplatonic movement. Our scholia, however, deal with the explanation of rare words (*γλῶσσαι*), obscure phrases (*λέξεις*), and proverbs (*παροιμίαι*), rather than with the exposition of the philosophical argument; and the extracts which contain quotations from Sophocles are representative of the general character of the collection. It is not surprising to find coincidences with Hesychius[6], since Diogenian, whose name is quoted four times in the scholia, must have been a common source of both. But the majority of the quotations was introduced to illustrate proverbs which occur in the text of Plato, and the scholia derive from the same sources as the paroemiographic corpus, to which we shall presently return.

[1] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 157; Cohn, *l.c.* 450.

[2] Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3. 52. [3] fr. 908.

[4] For Aristides see *Paroem.* 1 p. XII, Crusius, *Anal.* p. 79. Steph. Byz. p. 249. 12 (cf. Suid. *s.v.* *Δωδωναῖον χαλκεῖον*) shows that he was later than Polemon, from whom he quoted.

[5] *FHG* IV 336.

[6] frs. 59, 425, 633: cf. also fr. 408, the substance of which goes back to Aristophanes of Byzantium.

Thus Didymus is referred to on *Cratyl.* 384 A in connexion with the proverb χαλεπὰ τὰ καλά, and to him rather than to Tarrhaeus[1] were due most of the quotations in schol. *rep.* 337 A. It should be noticed that the explanations of the Platonic scholia are generally fuller and richer than the text of the corpus.

Scholia on Alexandrians.

The scholia to the Alexandrians, of whom Apollonius Rhodius is for the present purpose the most important, may be taken together. In all of them Theon[2] occupies a position analogous to that of Didymus in the criticism of the tragedians and Pindar. The *subscriptio* to the Laurentian MS of Apollonius states that the scholia are taken from Lucillus Tarrhaeus, Sophocles, and Theon. This is interpreted to mean that Sophocles put together the collection in the fourth century from the earlier commentaries of Lucillus and Theon[3]. Irenaeus (also known by the Latinized name of Minucius Pacatus), who is mentioned four times in the scholia as the author of a commentary (ὑπόμνημα), seems to have belonged to the latter part of the first century A.D. Theon was the sole source of all that is valuable in the scholia to Theocritus, but our collection belongs to a later date. Wilamowitz conjectured that they were edited by Amarantus, an elder contemporary of Galen, whose name is attached in the *Etymologicum Magnum* to the views expressed in the scholia[4]. This assumption agrees with the fact that the scholia often controvert the opinions of a certain Munatius, who is identified with Munatius ὁ κριτικός, a native of Tralles and a member of the circle of Herodes Atticus[5]. In Steph. Byz. p. 375, 10 we read that Theon, Plutarch, and Demetrius Phalereus were the names of the commentators on Nicander. The last-mentioned is unquestionably an error for Demetrius Chlorus who is referred to in several notes[6] as supporting views subsequently rejected by Antigonus. Antigonus lived in the early part of the first century B.C., as is inferred from the position in which his name

[1] Cf. fr. 160. According to Cohn, in *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* Suppl. XIII at p. 840, Tarrhaeus was the immediate source of these scholia. See however Crusius, *Anal.* p. 94 f. Is Κλείταρχος an error for Κλέαρχος (Crusius, *Anal.* p. 83) in schol. *rep.* 337 A?

[2] See p. xliv.

[3] Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* p. 187.

[4] See *Etym. M.* p. 273, 41, as compared with schol. Theocr. 7. 154.

[5] Philostr. *vit. soph.* 1. 25. 16.

[6] *Ther.* 377, 585, 748.

occurs in the preface to Erotian[1], so that in the case of Nicander we are able to pass back to sources anterior to Theon. On the other hand, with the exception of Theon, tradition is silent respecting the names of those who worked on the text of Lycophron until the time of Nicetas, the bishop of Serrha, who copied out the codex Marcianus 476 in the eleventh century.

Homeric scholia.

It is unnecessary for the present purpose to examine in detail the history of the Homeric scholia; for it is notorious that they contain rich stores of Alexandrian learning. Even in the limited field of Sophoclean quotations the value of Venetus A is manifest. From the *subscriptiones* at the end of every book it appears that the collection, which was perhaps made in the second century A.D., was based upon an amalgamation of excerpts from Didymus' *περὶ τῆς Ἀριστάρχειου διορθώσεως*, Aristonicus' *περὶ σημείων τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας*[2], Herodian's *περὶ τῆς Ὁμηρικῆς προσῳδίας*, and Nicanor's *περὶ Ὁμηρικῆς στιγμῆς*. The works of Didymus, Aristonicus, and Nicanor belonged to the department of textual criticism; and of the ten quotations and allusions which rest upon the authority of Ven. A five may be conjectured to owe their survival to Herodian[3]. The explanation of *γλῶσσαι* and *λέξεις*[4], where the scholia are found to be in agreement with the extant lexicons, was largely the work of Aristarchus, whose name is mentioned together with Apion and Heliodorus in Hesychius' prefatory letter to Eulogius. The lexicon of Apollonius, which depended on the same sources, survives only in an abridged form, so that it is seldom of value where a fuller version exists elsewhere[5]. In one case we are referred to the authority of Crates of Mallus[6]. The elucidation of mythological details was the principal subject of Didymus' *ὑπομνήματα*[7], and many notes of this complexion in the scholia are attributed to him by name.

Eustathius.

In connexion with the scholia the Homeric commentaries

[1] p. 32, 11 Klein. Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa 1 2422.

[2] This was a digest of Aristarchus' explanation of the critical signs (obelus, &c.) used by him in his edition.

[3] frs. 43, 94, 582, 901, 1056.

[4] See *e.g.* frs. 454, 611, 785, 793, 906.

[5] Apollonius, *s.v.* κατά, quotes Δ 424 (fr. 898) for κατά = ἐπί.

[6] fr. 1060.

[7] Schol. δ 4 may be an example (1 p. 141).

(*παρεκβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ὁμήρου Ἰλιάδα* [*Ὀδύσσειαν*]) of Eustathius must be mentioned. They were written at some time before 1175 A.D., in which year their author was appointed Archbishop of Thessalonica by the emperor Manuel I. The value of the books consists in their enormously rich store of extracts from philological writings which have now been lost; for it is quite certain that the quotations from the ancient classics were all at second hand, and that the plays of Sophocles outside the selection had perished long before the time of Eustathius[1]. Nor does Eustathius seek to conceal his dependence upon earlier sources, although he often succeeds in hiding their identity by the use of such vague expressions as *φασί*, *κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς*, *λέγεται*, and the like[2]. But, although this lack of precision and still more the tendency to garble his extracts by abbreviation are to be regretted, the main channels of tradition which Eustathius followed are either obvious or have been definitely ascertained[3]. Thus, he borrowed large blocks of material from the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus, and is in no sense an independent witness for the quotations of the earlier writer[4]. It should also be noticed that his text of Athenaeus was the epitomized version represented in the MSS known as C and E[5]. Strabo was copied almost as freely as Athenaeus, but only twice where Sophocles is concerned[6]. Next, it is certain that much of Eustathius is nearly related to the tradition of the Homeric scholia. For the *Iliad* he employed a MS containing a collection of scholia which

[1] This fact was first clearly recognized by Valckenaer, *Opusc.* I 337 f. Jebb on *O. T.* 1264 and on *Ant.* 292 (at p. 250) gives the impression that Eustathius' quotations were usually made at first hand. It is clear, also, from the remarks in his *Bacchylides* (p. 76) that he took the same view of citations by such writers as Stobaeus and Priscian. Rutherford in his *New Phrynichus* (p. 84) does not appear to have observed that the evidence of the *Etym. M.* goes back to the older authorities from which it is derived.

[2] *φασί*: frs. 166, 237, 702, 791, 794, 1006. *κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς* (*φασὶν οἱ παλαιοί*): frs. 108, 1046, 1049, 1087. *λέγεται*: fr. 1105.

[3] In the following account much use has been made of Cohn's article in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1452—1489.

[4] frs. 19, 28, 111, 127, 154, 181, 314. 275, 318, 329, 378, 395, 565, 718, 760.

[5] For examples see the nn. on frs. 154, 181 (where A has *πέπον*), 318.

[6] See fr. 1086, 1 p. 86. Eustathius frequently quotes from an epitome of Stephen of Byzantium, but there is no such instance in the Sophoclean sources.

bore the names of Apion and Herodorus[1], and was derived from the same sources as the scholia in the extant MSS. Thus, the text of Eustathius sometimes coincides with Ven. A[2], sometimes with Ven. B or Townl., and is sometimes supplementary to both. As an instance of the last-named alternative we may quote fr. 458, which is one of several examples of *παραλειψις* given by Eustathius as well as by the Paris MS 2766 of the thirteenth century[3] in addition to those appearing in schol. BT. In the *Odyssey* Eustathius followed a similar course; but, since the existing scholia to the *Odyssey* are much less full and important than those to the *Iliad*, the value of the tradition represented by Eustathius becomes comparatively greater. Fr. 108 was found by Eustathius in his MS, amongst other illustrations of the word *ἐπήβολος*, as part of a note of Porphyrius which is also preserved in the *Ὁμηρικὰ ζητήματα*, whereas in our scholia[4] the reference to Archippus[5] is the only one of the post-Homeric quotations remaining[6]. To Porphyrius should probably be referred the interesting fr. 790, since it comes from an allegorizing original which explained Athena as *φρόνησις* and Poseidon as *ὑγρότης εὔψυχος*[7]. The origin of the material in Eustathius is sometimes obscured by the severe curtailment of the Odyssean scholia. Thus, his allusion to the *Euryalus* of Sophocles[8] is part of a note rich in genealogical details attested by references to Hesiod, Aristotle, Hellanicus, and the Cyclic epics. We might well speculate how Eustathius became possessed of so much information drawn from ancient authorities, were it not that the bare skeleton of the earlier part of the note is preserved by schol. Q[9].

[1] Nothing is known of these persons except their names, which are possibly fictitious. Apion cannot be the Alexandrian grammarian of that name.

[2] See frs. 43, 94, 1056.

[3] Cramer, *anecd. Par.* III 274. But cod. 2679 (*anecd. Par.* III 5) was copied from Eustathius and is consequently worthless: cf. fr. 611. The same remark applies to cod. 1767 (frs. 776, 929). See Cohn, *l.c.* 1485.

[4] Schol. EQR Hom. *β* 319. [5] fr. 37, 1 687 K.

[6] Porphyrius' note appears also in *Etym. M.* p. 357, 18, with all the Attic quotations except that from Sophocles.

[7] The latter identification was Stoic: Cornut. 22, Cic. *n.d.* 1. 40.

[8] 1 p. 145.

[9] Eustath. *Od.* p. 1796, 35 *ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι γενεαλογοῦσι Διὸς μὲν καὶ Εὐρυοδίας Ἀρκείσιον· αὐτοῦ δὲ καὶ Χαλκομεδούσης Λαέρτην· τοῦ δὲ καὶ Ἀντικλείας Ὀδυσσέα· οἳ καὶ

Eustathius seldom referred to the scholia on other authors, so that it would be wrong to suppose that fr. 895 was borrowed by him from the scholia to Euripides. An examination of the context in Eustathius reveals that he has introduced into his commentary a long extract from the work of Suetonius *περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι παιδιῶν*. The same origin is to be attributed to frs. 429 and 479. The name of the author is not given by Eustathius, but is mentioned by Suidas[1], who records the existence of another work by him entitled *περὶ δυσφήμων λέξεων ἤτοι βλασφημιῶν καὶ πόθεν ἑκάστη*. To the *περὶ βλασφημιῶν* Eustathius owed his acquaintance with frs. 720 and 885. It is at first sight surprising that these little-known works, written in Greek by a Roman historian of the age of Hadrian, should have survived and continued in use until the late Byzantine era. No less striking than the survival of Suetonius, who was, of course, the depositary of earlier learning, is the appearance in Eustathius of a number of quotations ascribed to Aristophanes of Byzantium[2]. The latter were held by Nauck in his monograph on Aristophanes to have been derived from the Homeric scholia; but the publication by Emmanuel Miller in 1868 of the contents of a remarkable MS formerly at Mt Athos[3] showed that these as well as the extracts from Suetonius had a peculiar history. For the MS comprises, besides the collection of proverbs attributed to Zenobius, short excerpts from Zenodorus *περὶ τῆς Ὁμήρου συνηθείας*, from the *λέξεις* (*περὶ ὀνομασίας ἡλικιῶν* and so forth) of Aristophanes, and from the works of Suetonius already quoted. Each of them contains passages closely parallel to the text of Eustathius, although he names Aristophanes alone of

Suetonius.

Πηνελόπης Τηλέμαχον· αὐτοῦ δὲ καὶ Πολυκάστης τῆς Νέστορος Περσέπτολιν, ὡς Ἡσίοδος (fr. 17)...Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν Ἰθακησίων πολιτείᾳ (fr. 506) καὶ Ἑλλάνικος δὲ (*FHG* 1 64) Τηλεμαχόν φασι Ναυσικάαν γῆμαι τὴν Ἀλκινόου καὶ γεννῆσαι τὸν Περσέπτολον· τινὲς δὲ καὶ τοιούτοις λόγοις ἐνευκαιροῦσιν. ἐκ Κίρκης υἱοὶ καθ' Ἡσίοδον (*Theog.* 1013) Ὀδυσσεῖ Ἄγριος καὶ Λατῖνος, ἐκ δὲ Καλυψοῦς Ναυσίθοος καὶ Ναυσίνοος. ὁ δὲ τὴν Τηλεγόνειαν γράψας Κυρηναῖος (*EGF* p. 58) ἐκ μὲν Καλυψοῦς Τηλέγονον υἱὸν Ὀδυσσεῖ ἀναγράφει ἢ Τηλέδαμον· ἐκ δὲ Πηνελόπης Τηλέμαχον καὶ Ἀρκεσίλαον· κατὰ δὲ Λυσίμαχον κτέ. Contrast with this schol. Q Hom. π 118 Ἀρκείσιος Εὐρυοδίας καὶ Διός, Λαέρτης δὲ Χαλκομεδούσης· Τηλεμάχου καὶ Πολυκάστης Περσέπτολις. See also fr. 454.

[1] *s.v.* Τράγκυλλος. [2] See frs. 792, 793, 1062, 1069.

[3] Now Paris. suppl. Gr. 1164. See Miller, *Mélanges de litt. gr.* pp. 407—436.

the three authors, and even in his case sometimes substitutes *φασί* or *κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς*. Thus the nature of the evidence leads irresistibly to the conclusion that Eustathius had before him a MS similar in character to the Athous, but giving the extracts in question in a much fuller form.

Among the chief sources of Eustathius must be included the Atticist lexicons of Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias, but, owing to his unfortunate methods of reference already described, it has become a question of some difficulty and complexity to determine the extent of territory to be assigned to one or both of them, and in a less degree to distinguish the boundaries of their respective provinces. So far as Sophocles is concerned, the name of Aelius Dionysius is not given as authority for any of the fragments, whereas that of Pausanias occurs four times[1]. But that is not all; for it is certain that many concealed references to them are introduced by the formulas *φασί*, *κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς*[2], *ἐν ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ*[3], *ἐν κατὰ στοιχεῖον λεξικῷ*[4], and the like. There is a large number of instances in which the tradition of the Atticists is repeated by Hesychius[5], and various explanations have been given of their agreement. Thus, it has been argued both that Aelius Dionysius borrowed from Diogenian, and that Diogenian plundered the Atticists. But since Diogenian and the Atticists were contemporary writers, it is a more likely explanation that the coincidences result from their having used the same sources[6]. Eustathius is usually fuller than Hesychius[7], and it is deserving of attention that he expressly adduces Didymus as his authority for the explanation of *ἄργεμα*, where Hesychius is silent[8]. Herennius Philo, to whom we shall return in another connexion, is mentioned by Eustathius six times,—twice as the author of the work *περὶ*

Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias.

Herennius Philo.

[1] frs. 268, 272, 311, 877.

[2] Aelius Dionysius (p. 234 Schwabe) is considered to have been the source from which we get fr. 1087.

[3] frs. 138, 748, 1093.

[4] fr. 496.

[5] The clearest instances are frs. 268, 311, 429, 596, 702, 877, 1006, 1046, 1084; but the list is not intended to be exhaustive of the points of contact between Hesychius and Eustathius.

[6] Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa V 990.

[7] See especially fr. 1046.

[8] fr. 233.

διαφόρων σημαινομένων. This book, which survived until the late Byzantine age, was the source of various lexicons of synonyms which were current under different names; and that such was the history of the extant lexicon of Ammonius περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων is shown by its agreement with the fragments of Herennius preserved by Eustathius. To Herennius, therefore, belongs the distinction between ἐσχάρα and βωμός which occasioned the quotation of fr. 730[1], and the record of ἐπίφατος in fr. 1048. We are not here concerned with the relation of Eustathius to any of the technical grammarians except Herodian; and the coincidence of his text with the ἐπιτομὴ τῶν ὀνοματικῶν κανόνων ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ, edited by Hilgard in a Heidelberg program of 1887, supports the view that such excerpts rather than the complete treatises of Herodian were alone accessible to him[2].

ἐπιμερισμοί.

Before leaving the subject of Homeric exegesis, some reference must be made to the ἐπιμερισμοί, class-books of grammatical analysis applied to the text of the Homeric poems. The analytical process must, of course, have existed from the earliest days of literary study[3], but in Byzantine times, as the circle of such studies continually narrowed, the professional teacher relied more and more upon the practical manuals variously assigned to the most eminent grammarians, and revised according to the needs of the age by their successors. Examples of such books have come down to us and some of them were published by J. A. Cramer in his *anecdota*. The earlier type was so arranged that the verbal explanations were made to follow the order of the text[4], but we are more immediately concerned with the class in which the lemmas are arranged in alphabetical order. Its

[1] From the same source Eustathius derived the excerpt from Alexion quoted on fr. 564, 2.

[2] There is a reference to these excerpts in 1 p. 168 (Hilgard, p. 11, 3). The epitome was also published by Cramer (*anecd. Ox.* IV 333). A similar epitome περὶ ἀκλίτων ῥημάτων Αἰλίου Ἡρωδιανοῦ (*ibid.* IV 338) appears in the same program and connects Herodian with fr. 164.

[3] Sext. Emp. *math.* 1. 161 speaks of ὁ κατὰ γραμματικὴν μερισμός as requiring subtraction (τὸ ἀφαιρεῖν) and addition (τὸ προστιθέναι).

[4] An example is cod. Coisl. 387 (tenth century) published in *anecd. Paris.* III 294—370.

most remarkable representative is the New College MS 298 (XIV cent.) published in vol. i of Cramer's *anecdota Oxoniensia*, which quotes five Sophoclean fragments[1] and is the sole authority for four of them. The grammatical sources most frequently named are Herodian and Aristonicus, and amongst others we find mention of Apollonius, Alexion, Heliodorus, Seleucus, and Tryphon. The latest in time are Philoponus, Orion, and Charax; and, since the name of Choeroboscus is absent, the collection may be assigned to the early part of the sixth century, between the dates of Charax and Choeroboscus[2]. It is certain that these works were based largely on the results of Herodian's labours, and several of them circulated in his name, although their authenticity is open to question[3].

Technical grammarians.

The name of Herodian, known as *ὁ τεχνικός* for his eminence among them, introduces us to the technical grammarians. *γραμματική* was a comprehensive term, embracing the various branches of scholarship, and, although Aristarchus paid much attention to *προσῳδία* and *ὀρθογραφία*, the great Alexandrians lived before the time when specialization had succeeded in cramping the grammarian's functions. Dionysius Thrax, the pupil of Aristarchus, was the father of grammar in the narrower sense of the term, although his activity was not limited within its bounds[4]. We are not concerned with the immediate development of the subject; for Apollonius Dyscolus of Alexandria, who belongs to the age of Hadrian, is the earliest of our authorities among the *τεχνικοί*. His influence upon posterity was extraordinary, and it is not too much to say that from his writings and those of his son Herodian the later world derived the whole of its grammatical knowledge[5]. His particular province was the functions of the different parts of speech, and he was the first writer of a treatise on syntax, large portions of which have been preserved[6]. He-

[1] frs. 114, 393, 521, 749, 750.

[2] Reitzenstein, *Gesch. d. Etymol.* 206.

[3] Lentz, I xvii—xxxiii. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* 374.

[4] Four fragments are quoted in the scholia to his *τέχνη*, one of which (fr. 751) certainly, and one (fr. 962) probably, belongs to the collection of Stephanus. Herodian is now ascertained to have been the authority followed in the citation of fr. 751.

[5] Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa II 136.

[6] From this book is quoted fr. 753. Fr. 471 comes from the separate work *περὶ ἀντωνυμίας*.

rodian, who was born at Alexandria, but lived subsequently at Rome and enjoyed the favour of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, made himself supreme in the domains of morphology and accentuation. His reputation, continually enhanced by the passage of his writings through the centuries, was earned by the skilful reconstruction and careful elaboration of the results which his predecessors had garnered, rather than by his success in establishing new principles of general application[1]. Thus the *περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* was derived from Tryphon[2], and his great work, the *καθολικὴ προσῳδία* in twenty-one books, was founded on the writings of Aristarchus, Tryphon, and Heracleides of Miletus[3]. The book is known to us chiefly through excerpts appropriated by Theodosius and Arcadius, and we are similarly placed in regard to all his other writings[4], with the exception of the small tract *περὶ μονήρους λέξεως*, which has survived intact. No fewer than fifteen valuable and independent quotations from the lost plays of Sophocles are preserved in this little treatise[5], and it is a remarkable fact that it contains no others from any tragic author, excepting two from Aeschylus and one from Aristias of Phlius[6]. One might not unreasonably infer that he either made for his own use a collection of these Sophoclean instances or had access to a list compiled by some one else[7]. The rhetorical treatise *περὶ σχημάτων*, from which is quoted the exceptionally interesting fr. 799, has nothing to do with Herodian the grammarian, although he is known to have made use of the same title[8]. There has been some controversy as to

[1] Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* 311. [2] *ibid.* 302. [3] Sandys, p. 321.

[4] His fragments were collected and edited by A. Lentz in 2 vols., Leipzig, 1867—1870. For the excerpts published by Hilgard after Cramer see p. lxx.

[5] See Nauck's Index. In fr. 521 Herodian is, of course, the source of the other authorities, and in fr. 46 his tradition is independent of Hesychius and the rest. Two quotations (frs. 360, 586) are repeated in the *περὶ διχρόνων* (Cramer, *anecd. Ox.* III 282 ff.), perhaps an excerpt from the *καθολικὴ προσῳδία*.

[6] It is extremely unlikely that Herodian could have read Aristias, whose memory scarcely survived outside the *πίνακες*. See also on fr. 362.

[7] It is worth notice that there is no quotation from any of the extant plays.

[8] Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* II[5] p. 709; Schultz in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 970; Lehrs, *Herodiani tria scripta emendatiora*, p. 422. The writer clearly borrowed from a learned source: he quotes after our passage Eur. fr. 132, and shortly before it Archil. fr. 69 and Anacr. fr. 3.

the authenticity of the severely curtailed Φιλέταιρος, which is printed at the end of Pierson's edition of Moeris (pp 431—453 of the 1759 edition). The little book is undoubtedly of the Atticist class, and has much in common with Phrynichus and the lexicographical sources of Pollux and Athenaeus. It is generally considered that Herodian had no affinity with the Atticists[1]; and, although the possibility of its genuineness has been advocated by Reitzenstein[2], neither title nor contents appear to support his view[3].

The edifice constructed by the labours of Herodian and his father was continually patched and repaired, enlarged or allowed partly to fall into decay, by the various workers who succeeded them; but the plan was never remodelled. It is needless to recite a list of these worthies, but mention must be made of Orus, who lived in the fifth century at Alexandria or Miletus or at both[4], since the *lexicon Messanense* edited by Rabe has been identified as a fragment of his work περὶ ὀρθογραφίας[5]. John Philoponus of Alexandria, who belonged to the age of Justinian and is well known for his commentaries on Aristotle,

[1] Some would except the συμπόσιον.

[2] *Gesch. d. gr. Etym.* pp. 377, 388—396.

[3] Lehrs (p. 421) thought that here and there might be a trace of Herodian. See L. Cohn in *Rh. Mus.* XLIII 406, who is followed by Schultz, *l.c.* 973. It should be observed that the reference to fr. 606 is undoubtedly an abridgement of the fuller account preserved by Pollux and Athenaeus. Now, Aesch. fr. 211, which is referred to by Athenaeus and indicated in the Φιλέταιρος, is quoted precisely by Herodian π. μον. Λέξ. p. 35, 19. At first sight this appears conclusive; but, when the various passages are examined with their context, it will be found that the surrounding conditions in the π. μον. Λέξ. are entirely different from those in Pollux and Athenaeus, and that, whereas the lexicographers were dealing with vocabulary, Herodian was seeking to establish a rule of morphology. Cohn's theory, which Reitzenstein combats, that Atticism was derived from the Pergamene scholars, or more particularly from Alexander Polyhistor, is another matter altogether. In Nauck's *Index Fontium* the Φιλέταιρος is run together with ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ also printed by Pierson (pp. 454—480) and in Lobeck's *Phrynichus*, p. 451 ff. That also is a work definitely Atticist in character.

[4] Some authorities put him about two centuries earlier (see Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* II[5] p. 885) on account of his work κατὰ Φρυνίχου κατὰ στοιχεῖον, sometimes identified with our *Antiatticist* (de Borries, Phryn. *praef. soph.* p. XXXIV), of which later. For Orus see also frs. 69, 333.

[5] Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 289 ff. The value of the quotations is due to the fact that Orus adapted an Atticist lexicon to his purpose.

quotes fr. 526, apparently from Orus. But he was himself a representative of the grammatical tradition, and fr. 461 appears in his extant work *περὶ τῶν διαφόρως τονουμένων καὶ διάφορα σημαινόντων*. Five fragments are preserved by Priscian, who was a contemporary of the emperor Anastasius (491—518). Though a Latin grammarian, he depended largely upon Greek authorities, and acknowledges in his dedication that it was his intention to translate into Latin the rules of Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian. In fact, much of the *Institutes* proves to be a reproduction of extant works of Apollonius and of the scholia to Dionysius Thrax[1]. Fr. 880, which comes from the minor work *de Terentii metris*, is of interest as belonging to another branch of learning. Priscian's source was Heliodorus the metrician, now securely dated in the middle of the first century A.D., who quoted Sophocles' line from the commentaries of Seleucus, the Homeric scholar and contemporary of Tiberius[2]. George Choeroboscus, perhaps the latest in date but by no means the least distinguished of the classical grammarians, occupied a professional chair at Constantinople in the early part of the sixth century. Several fragments of Sophocles are preserved in his lectures on the *εἰσαγωγικοὶ κανόνες περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων* of Theodosius of Alexandria, which were afterwards published from the notes of his pupils. There is no doubt that he depends upon lost works of Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, and Orus, but he seems to have used them only in intermediate sources, especially the writings of Philoponus and the grammarian Zenobius[3]. Choeroboscus is also our chief authority for two quotations drawn from his commentary on the *Enchiridion* of Hephaestion[4], in which he represents the tradition of the

[1] Teuffel-Schwabe, tr. Warr, II p. 523. The eighteenth book of the *Institutes* corresponds to the third of Apollonius *περὶ συντάξεως*: Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa II 139. Bekker's third lexicon (*anecd.* 117—180) may be mentioned in this connexion: see frs. 696, 739. In its present shape it is very late, as the quotations show; but it also contains old material and was originally based on collections made from the speeches of Demosthenes and Isocrates.

[2] Hense in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 28, Susemihl, *op. cit.* II 226_{21}.

[3] Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* 361.

[4] Now published in full in Consbruch's *Hephaestion*, pp. 177—254. Parts of it taken from the inferior codex Saibantianus appeared in Gaisford's posthumous edition

ancient metrical learning descended from Aristophanes of Byzantium.

Paroemiographers.

The influence of the paroemiographical tradition has been noticed in relation to the scholia on Pindar and Plato; and the sources employed by these writers will next be described. It is unfortunate that the proverbial corpus is still accessible only in the edition of von Leutsch and Schneidewin published at Göttingen in 1839[1]. For the publication by Emmanuel Miller of the Athoan MS mentioned above[2] threw an entirely new light on the history of these collections. It has been shown by Otto Crusius[3] that the vulgate MSS used by the editors of the corpus represent later collections made in alphabetical order, and containing either 552 proverbs attributed to Zenobius or about 1000 without an editor's name[4]. But, though these MSS still have their value in supplying the gaps in our knowledge of the earlier corpus, it is certain that the Athoan and other MSS which have since been found to belong to the same group represent a more primitive attempt to form a corpus in which the proverbs of Zenobius were retained in their original order. In the archetype of these MSS the corpus was divided into five parts, of which the first three contained the proverbs of Zenobius, the fourth those passing by the name of Plutarch and entitled *περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι παροιμιῶν*[5], and the fifth a collection

(1855). Hoerschelmann (*Rh. Mus.* XXXVI 300) was the first to recognize the authorship of Choeroboscus, since confirmed by the heading of cod. R. The two passages of Sophocles quoted by Choeroboscus (frs. 240, 795) are adduced in the same connexion by the Anonymus Ambrosianus *de re metrica* edited by W. Studemund in Schoell and Studemund's *anecdota varia*, I pp. 211—256. I am not aware that the relation of the anonymous writer to Choeroboscus has been investigated.

[1] This book, which is itself not easy to procure, superseded for practical purposes the edition of Gaisford (Oxford, 1836). In the present work, except where for special reasons it has been necessary to refer to Miller's *Mélanges*, the notation of the Göttingen corpus has been preserved in preference to the numbers of the Athoan and other MSS.

[2] p. lxviii.

[3] *Analecta crit. ad paroem. Gr.* (Leipzig, 1883), p. 16 ff.

[4] The Paris MS 3070[b] (XII cent.) is the chief representative of the former class, and the Bodleian (XV cent.) of the latter. Gaisford's edition is still valuable for its reproduction of the Bodleian; for the Göttingen editors transferred to an *Appendix proverbiorum* (I 379—467) only such proverbs belonging to the anonymous collection as were not found in the Zenobian.

[5] Fragments separately edited by O. Crusius, Leipzig, 1887.

made by an unknown sophist at a late date for use in the rhetorical schools. A reference to Nauck's *Index Fontium* will show that Zenobius—even within the limits of the Göttingen corpus[1]—is by far the most important of the paroemiographers as a source of quotations from tragedy; and although Macarius, Gregory of Cyprus, and Apostolius are not entirely valueless as witnesses to the tradition, they belong essentially to the same group, and do not represent an early collection independent of Zenobius. The same remark applies to the collection of 776 Zenobian proverbs which passes by the name of Diogenian but has nothing whatever to do with the lexicographer of that name[2]. Zenobius, the author of the collection which lies at the base of all extant records, was a sophist who lived in the reign of Hadrian, and his work is described by Suidas as *ἐπιτομὴ τῶν παροιμιῶν Διδύμου καὶ Ταρραίου ἐν βιβλίοις γ'*. Lucillus Tarrhaeus we have already encountered as one of those responsible for the scholia to Apollonius Rhodius; but, though materials are lacking to determine the exact date of his literary labours[3], the character of the two passages where he is quoted *verbatim*, apart from the fact that, while Didymus wrote in thirteen books, Tarrhaeus as well as Zenobius wrote in three[4], shows that Tarrhaeus cannot have been the intermediate source between Didymus and Zenobius[5]. We must rather regard Didymus, with whose methods we are now familiar, as having provided Zenobius with the bulk of his material and especially with his quotations, while additions of moderate length were made from the stories relating to various localities collected by Tarrhaeus in the course of his travels. Thus we have seen that Didymus rather than Tarrhaeus was the source of fr. 160[6], and the same is doubtless true of the remainder of our fragments.

[1] It should be remembered that the *Appendix proverbiorum* is also Zenobian.

[2] Their ascription to Diogenian is explained by Crusius, *Anal.* p. 23. See also Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa v 783.

[3] C. Mueller (*FHG* IV 440), who has collected all the notices relating to him, makes him a little older than Didymus or else his contemporary.

[4] Helladius ap. Phot. *bibl.* p. 530[a] 10.

[5] Crusius, *op. cit.* p. 93 f.

[6] See p. lxiv. His name is expressly recorded in connexion with fr. 981. For fr. 811 see Crusius, p. 78; and for fr. 37 *ib.* p. 142.

although his authority cannot in every case be directly traced. Didymus, of course, made his collection from the earlier writers who had occupied themselves with the investigation of proverbs either current in speech or recorded in literature. Of these the most important were Aristotle, Theophrastus, Clearchus, Demon, Chrysippus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Dionysodorus of Troezen, and Aristides. But Didymus was not merely a compiler: while he brought together the explanations previously given, he exercised his judgement freely in selecting from amongst them, or in rejecting them all in favour of another suggested by his own researches. Hence the fact that Zenobius often records a series of explanatory glosses, although the names of their advocates are seldom preserved[1]. Thus Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose name is recorded in connexion with fr. 1044[2], and who, according to the reasonable inference of Crusius, was the source of fr. 198[3], was rebuked by Didymus for charging the old poets with plagiarism[4]. Fr. 406 was one of the proverbs explained by Chrysippus[5]; and Demon, who belonged to the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century, certainly discussed the proverb Σαρδόνιος γέλως, although he is not the source to which we owe the reference to the *Daedalus*[6].

Lexicography.

We pass to the lexicographers, the most copious, if not the most fruitful source of our information. The supreme importance of Hesychius in relation to the tragedians can easily be measured by consulting the references to him in Nauck's Index; but the history of the development which explains the composition of his work has been treated in the preceding section, and sundry explanations bearing on other lexicographers have already been given and need not be repeated here. Aristophanes of Byzantium was the founder of Greek lexicography; and his immediate followers, adhering strictly to his example, confined their efforts to the compilation of lists (γλῶσσαι or λέξεις), not necessarily alphabetical, of the words and phrases current in a particular branch of literature or appropriate to a particular art.

[1] For examples see Zenob. 5. 85 (fr. 160), 6. 11 (fr. 908).
[2] Zenob. 3. 63. [3] *Anal* p. 150. [4] *ibid.* p. 153.
[5] Arnim III p. 202; Crusius, *op. cit.* p. 82.
[6] See p. lxiv.

An early example was the γλῶσσαι of Nicander, frequently quoted by Athenaeus, which seems to have been intended to explain obscure terms of local currency; another, also familiar to readers of Athenaeus, was the ὀψαρτυτικαὶ λέξεις of Artemidorus; and several collections of dialectical and literary words were made by Tryphon. A favourite subject was, of course, the explanation of Homeric γλῶσσαι, in which all subsequent workers drew largely upon the labours of Aristarchus. The extant lexicon of Apollonius has already been mentioned in this connexion[1]. The συναγωγὴ τῶν παρ' Ἱπποκράτει λέξεων of Erotian is one of the most valuable remnants of Greek lexicography, and alone preserves a number of tragic fragments, though often, unfortunately, in a corrupt form. The author belonged to the second half of the first century, and his book was dedicated to Andromachus, the emperor Nero's physician. His chief source was the Hippocratean glossary of Baccheius of Tanagra (*c.* 200 B.C.), which is quoted 64 times, and through him he derived much grammatical learning, including many quotations from the poets[2], from the λέξεις of Aristophanes of Byzantium[3]. But Erotian also relied on other authorities, amongst whom Heracleides of Tarentum (*c.* 75 B.C.), the author of a grammatical treatise in three books πρὸς Βακχεῖον περὶ τῶν Ἱπποκράτους λέξεων[4], deserves special mention. The coincidence of Hesychius and Erotian in fr. 550 is due to the fact that Erotian was amongst the authorities consulted by Diogenian[5]. An explanation of the greater fullness of Hesychius is to be found in the condition of our

[1] See p. lxv. Although in frs. 729, 1092 Apollonius gives more than Hesychius, a fuller version is usually preserved by Hesychius and other Byzantines. Fragments of such a version were published from an Egyptian papyrus by E. W. B. Nicholson in *C. R.* XI 390.

[2] Erotian p. 31, 12 (of Baccheius) πολλὰς παραθέμενον εἰς τοῦτο μαρτυρίας ποιητῶν.

[3] His influence can be established in other passages than the seven or eight where he is cited by name. For the use made of him by Baccheius see Klein's *Erotian*, p. xxiv.

[4] Erotian, p. 22, 19; 32, 2. The date of Heracleides was wrongly given (after authorities now obsolete) in the n. on fr. 236. But Erotian, p. 32, 2, has been strangely misinterpreted; for, though Klein's statement (p. XXVIII) is quite clear, Wellmann (in Pauly-Wissowa II 149, 2790) twice makes Apollonius of Citium the author of the three books against Baccheius.

[5] So Cohn infers from the statement in the introductory letter to Eulogius that Diogenian collected τὰς παρὰ τοῖς ἰατροῖς λέξεις (Pauly-Wissowa VIII 547).

text of Erotian, which has been proved by Daremberg's discovery of extracts from Erotian among the Vatican scholia to Hippocrates[1] to be a mangled abridgement of the original work. Aristophanes' collection of Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις was put together with the object of elucidating the sense in which they were employed by classical authors; and we may account in the same way for the similar titles found amongst the writings attributed to Crates of Mallus, Demetrius Ixion, Philemon, and others. But the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις of Dorotheus, of which Athenaeus quotes the 108th book[2], belonged to the class of encyclopaedic compilations which were characteristic of the first century A.D., and of which the joint work of Pamphilus and Zopyrion was the most famous specimen. The earliest representative of Atticism in the narrower and stricter sense, *i.e.* the school which aimed at the maintenance of a pure Attic style in contemporary literature and conducted its researches into classical usage with this express purpose in view, was Irenaeus, the pupil of Heliodorus the metrician[3], known also by the Latinized name Minucius Pacatus. This tendency appears clearly in a fragment of Irenaeus quoted by Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian of the fifth century, in which the philosophical meaning of ὑπόστασις is condemned as βαρβαρον, because the word was used by Sophocles as equivalent to ἑνέδρα[4]. Aelius Dionysius, who lived in the age of Hadrian, wrote Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα in five books, and published two editions, both of which were recognized by Eustathius[5]. The work was well known to Photius, who gives the above particulars in his *bibliotheca*[6], and its influence upon Byzantine lexicography was very extensive. Pausanias, a Syrian and a contemporary of Galen, wrote a similar work, which in the time of Photius was regarded as a companion volume to the earlier lexicon, and was bound up with it accordingly[7]. The difficulty of distinguishing

Atticist lexicons.

[1] Klein, p. XVII ff.

[2] 329 D, where the title is given as Λέξεων συναγωγή.

[3] See p. lxxiv. The same date is indicated by the fact that Erotian quoted him (p. 25, 3).

[4] fr. 719. [5] *Od.* p. 1944. 8; p. 1958. 1. [6] cod. 152.

[7] Phot. *bibl.* cod. 153 ἀνεγνώσθη δὲ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τεύχει.

them has been increased, as we have seen, by the carelessness of Eustathius; but in general it may be inferred that Aelius Dionysius was more nearly concerned with questions of form and expression, whereas Pausanias dealt with the technicalities relating to public and private antiquities, and especially with the explanation of proverbs[1]. Though the general line of their tradition is free from doubt, the identity of the sources actually followed is often obscure; for it is uncertain how much they took direct from Aristophanes of Byzantium, or how much from Didymus, Pamphilus, and Irenaeus. Their relation to Diogenian has already been considered[2]. In spite of the difficulty involved in tracing the influence of lost works, Eustathius has revealed enough to enable us to identify them as one of the chief sources followed by Photius in his lexicon, and to establish their claim to the ownership of a number of glosses in the sixth lexicon included in Bekker's *anecdota*[3]. Evidence bearing on both these points will be found in the glosses which contain some of the Sophoclean fragments[4]. The survival of part of his work has made Phrynichus the best known of the Atticists to modern scholars. He lived in the latter half of the second century, and his great work the σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή was composed in thirty-seven books. With the exception of the fragments which can be recovered from other texts, the only part which has come down to us is the extract (ἐκ τῶν Φρυνίχου τοῦ Ἀραβίου τῆς σοφιστικῆς προπαρασκευῆς) preserved in the codex Coislinianus 345, and published as the first lexicon in Bekker's *anecdota* (pp. 1—74). It has recently been re-edited by J. de Borries[5], together with a collection of the fragments. Much better

[1] E. Schwabe in his edition of their fragments (Leipzig, 1890) made no attempt to distinguish between the two writers.

[2] p. lxix.

[3] pp. 319—476. It is entitled συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων ἐκ διαφόρων σοφῶν τε καὶ ῥητόρων πολλῶν. The part published by Bekker only covers the letter α. The name of Dionysius occurs at p. 362, 3.

[4] For Photius see frs. 1087, 1093. The name of Pausanias appears in connexion with frs. 268, 877, and may perhaps be inferred in relation to fr. 420. ῥητορικὸν λεξικόν is quoted for frs. 138, 748; and οἱ παλαιοί (fr. 994) is probably Aelius Dionysius.

[5] Leipzig, 1911. The book is unfortunately disfigured by numerous errors, and many of the fragments are assigned to Phrynichus on unconvincing grounds.

known, however, owing to the editions of Lobeck and Rutherford, is his earlier and shorter work in two books, which was entitled ἐκλογὴ ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων Ἀττικῶν. Phrynichus belonged to the severest school of Atticism, and framed his canons in accordance with the usage of Aristophanes, Thucydides, Plato, and Demosthenes; so that his appeals to Sophocles were occasional in character, when examples of the poetic style were introduced by way of illustration[1]. The influence of Phrynichus upon his successors is recognizable for us chiefly in Bekker's sixth lexicon, where his name is quoted more frequently than in any other ancient document[2], and in Photius. This relationship has been much more clearly established since the recovery of the early part of Photius, to be mentioned later[3]. Phrynichus was by no means a mere copyist or epitomator; he was diligent in collecting material from the sources available to him, and he exercised an independent judgement in the general inferences which he drew from it. His eminence is shown by his rivalry with Julius Pollux for the favour of the emperor Commodus[4], although he failed in his candidature for the professorial chair at Athens which was given to Pollux. But it is altogether unreasonable to suppose that he went so far as to gather most of his illustrations directly from the pages of his Attic models[5]; for we cannot believe that he discarded the labours of his predecessors any more than a modern scholar would refuse to avail himself of the help of indexes and lexicons. Thus, it is highly probable that he profited by the work of Irenaeus περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου, in which an attempt was made to show that the Alexandrian usage was the direct descendant of the Attic[6]. But we are not left to rely upon conjecture, since there is direct evidence that he used the lexicons of Diogenian and

[1] frs. 128 and 1064, the only two from the ἐκλογή, illustrate this point.

[2] fr. 357 is a good example.

[3] No less than nineteen of de Borries's fragments contain references to Sophocles. But several of these (frs. 53, 68, 133, 134, 146, 244) are of uncertain origin.

[4] Scarcely veiled instances of the controversy will be found in Rutherford's edition at pp. 157, 208, 251, 267, 331.

[5] As de Borries seems to suggest on pp. XII, XXIII, though he subsequently modifies the statement (p. XXVI).

[6] Rutherford, p. 479; de Borries, p. XXVI.

Aelius Dionysius[1]. Helladius, the author of a miscellany of useful information composed in verse, who belongs to the early part of the fourth century, survives in the prose version preserved by Photius in his *bibliotheca*. He has so many points of contact with Phrynichus that the σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή has sometimes been regarded as the sole source of his grammatical information; but the conclusion is not generally accepted[2]. The *Antiatticist*, the second in order of Bekker's lexicons[3], represents a reaction against the severest school of Atticism, and was written with the object of showing that numerous words and phrases which had passed under the ban, were in fact employed by Attic writers of the best period. The authorship is quite uncertain, but it was probably first put together before the time of Orus, to whom Ritschl and others have assigned it[4]. The author's method was to take illustrations from earlier grammarians of repute, and to quote the reference to the ancient text. It has been argued that his chief source was the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις of Aristophanes of Byzantium[5]; and several of our glosses show points of contact with Diogenian[6] and Herodian[7]. There are two cases in our collection[8] showing an unexpected agreement with Phrynichus, but these may be due to the mutilation of our text. It should be observed that the *Antiatticist* quotes twenty-five fragments from Sophocles as against twelve taken from Euripides and four from Aeschylus. Just as Euripides was for obvious reasons the favourite of the anthologists, so Sophocles, not because of any preference based on literary grounds, but owing to the character of his diction, was the tragic model selected by the γραμματικοί.

[1] Schol. Hermog. ap. Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* v 486 (*praep. soph.* p. 115, 23 de B.). For Aelius Dionysius see also Rutherford, pp. 132, 209.

[2] Gudeman in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 101. There is a coincidence with Phrynichus in fr. 811, but not in fr. 734.

[3] Bekk. *anecd.* pp. 75—116.

[4] Christ-Schmid, *op. cit.* II[5] p. 696; de Borries, p. XXXV. Our version is clearly an epitome.

[5] See L. Cohn in *Jahrb. f. cl. Philol.* Suppl. XII 292. Observe the agreement of p. 91, 16 with Ar. Byz. ap. Eustath. *Od.* p. 1761, 31.

[6] frs. 169, 517, 616.

[7] frs. 280, 518, 612.

[8] frs. 408, 669.

Rhetorical lexicons.

The lexicons hitherto discussed were known among the Byzantines as 'rhetorical' owing to their subservience to practical needs, but there is another class more properly so called which had for its object the elucidation of the Attic orators. We are chiefly concerned with Harpocration, whose ultimate sources were the commentaries of Didymus[1] on the orators, and the Ἀτθίδες composed by various historians. He seems to have employed immediately the same onomasticon which was epitomized in Bekker's fifth lexicon[2]. Harpocration is usually identified with the teacher of the emperor L. Verus, although some authorities place him as early as the reign of Tiberius. The citation of fr. 502 is the occasion of a remarkably puzzling coincidence between Harpocration and Athenaeus. Both texts have been confused by compression, but in a different way; and, according to a recent explanation, it appears that the codex of Harpocration was interpolated from Athenaeus at a time when the *Deipnosophists* existed in a fuller form than is represented by the Marcianus[3]. Claudius Casilo, who, according to Nauck's conjecture[4], was a sophist of the fourth century, is nearly related to Harpocration. The fragments published by Miller from the Athous[5] bear a close resemblance to the glosses in the margin of the Cambridge Harpocration[6], and it is possible that Claudius Casilo, whoever he was, was also the editor of that collection.

Pollux.

Julius Pollux, the rival of Phrynichus, whose ὀνομαστικόν in

[1] One of the new fragments (fr. 510) comes from a papyrus containing a portion of Didymus' commentary on Demosthenes.

[2] Λέξεις ῥητορικαί: Bekk. *anecd.* pp. 195–318. For an example see fr. 449, originally attached to a passage in Lysias.

[3] See H. Schultz in Pauly-Wissowa VII 2415. The problem is too intricate for discussion here, since it has no bearing on the text of Sophocles, unless we infer that Harpocration's πέτραν should be rejected in v. 3. But, though it is held that Harpocration was interpolated from Athenaeus, so that the authority of the latter's text would be superior, it will be observed that on Schultz's hypothesis the accidental substitution of ἄκραν for πέτραν may have been due to the epitomator of the *Deipnosophists*.

[4] See L. Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa Suppl. I 318.

[5] *Mélanges*, p. 397 f.

[6] The *lex. Cant.* was first edited by Dobree, and published as an Appendix to Porson's *Photius*.

ten books published between 166 and 176 A.D. is still extant, was an Atticist of the milder type. He admitted much that Aelius Dionysius and Phrynichus had rejected; for it was his object to construct a complete vocabulary of Attic names arranged according to subject-matter. But, while following the precedent set by Telephus[1] in his alphabetical *περὶ χρήσεως, ἤτοι ὀνομάτων ἐσθῆτος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἷς χρώμεθα*, he professes to aim not so much at comprehensiveness as at purity of diction[2]. He made use of various sources in the composition of the different books: in the preface to the seventh book he speaks of the numerous writings, both verse and prose, which he has consulted, and in those to the ninth and tenth books he refers to the disappointing character of the information to be gathered from the *ὀνομαστικόν* of Gorgias[3] and the *σκευοφορικός* of Eratosthenes. Thus in the second book he followed the anatomical treatise of Rufus Ephesius[4], and his close agreement with Athenaeus in the passage from which fr. 241 is taken probably indicates that Pollux drew from Juba's *θεατρικὴ ἱστορία* or from the monograph *περὶ αὐλῶν καὶ ὀργάνων* constituting the third book of Tryphon's *περὶ ὀνομασιῶν*. The fragments of Sophocles comprise some 36 for which Pollux is our sole authority, and 15 in which he is supported by Hesychius either alone or with others. Fr. 877 shows that the quotation ultimately goes back to the common source of Pausanias and Diogenian; in all probability to Didymus, whose influence can be detected in regard to frs. 11, 36, and 482. Fr. 89, if not also fr. 734, goes back to Aristophanes of Byzantium; and the same writer's work *περὶ προσώπων* was probably the source of Pollux 4. 133—154, from which we learn interesting details respecting the masks worn by the actors taking the parts of Thamyras and Tyro[5].

Stephen of Byzantium.

It has already been mentioned[6] that Eustathius quotes a work on synonyms by Herennius Philo of Byblus, whose period of activity was late in the first or early in the second century.

[1] Suid. *s.v.*

[2] 1. 2 *πεφιλοτίμηται οὐ τοσοῦτον εἰς πλῆθος ὁπόσον εἰς κάλλους ἐκλογήν.*

[3] The identity of this writer is doubtful: Susemihl, II 501_{181}.

[4] See p. lviii. [5] I p. 177, II p. 271. [6] p. lxx.

But another of his works, which was entitled *περὶ πόλεων καὶ οὓς ἑκάστη αὐτῶν ἐνδόξους ἤνεγκε* in 30 books, is of much greater importance, since it was the principal source followed by Stephanus of Byzantium (*c.* 530 A.D.), who even in the extant epitome of his *ethnica* mentions Philo's name 33 times. From the fact that Apollodorus is mentioned by Stephanus 82 times and Artemidorus about 80[1], it has been inferred that both were extensively used by Herennius. To these authorities we should at least add Hecataeus and Alexander Polyhistor, whose names occur 300 and 100 times respectively. The position of Strabo (cited 200 times) is more doubtful, since Herennius would have no occasion to follow the copy when he had access to the originals. Stephanus, of course, did not follow Herennius exclusively; but in matters of etymology and *προσῳδία* had recourse to Herodian (cited 80 times) and Orus (cited 14 times)[2]. An examination of the context in which the quotations from Sophocles occur, favours the conclusion that the majority of them reached Stephanus through Herodian.

Cyril—glossaries

A rhetorical lexicon attributed to the Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria exists in numerous MSS exhibiting various recensions, but has never been edited except in extracts arbitrarily selected[3]. In these circumstances neither the date of its composition nor the sources from which it was derived have been ascertained, although it is admitted to have played an important part in the successive developments of Byzantine lexicography. Thus, a Cyril-glossary was the basis of the *συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων* published from cod. Coislin. 345 in Bachmann's *anecdota*[4]. The glosses beginning with *α* and taken from the same MS had already appeared as the sixth lexicon comprised in

[1] For these authors see p. lii. It is hardly possible to place the Sophoclean fragments; but one might guess that fr. 579 came from Apollodorus. It should of course be remembered that Stephanus exists for the most part only in an epitome. For a specimen of the fuller text see on fr. 460.

[2] The above facts are taken from Gudeman's article in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 654 ff.

[3] See Cramer, *anecd. Par.* IV 177—201 (frs. 390, 391). Fr. 175 comes from an extract published by Schow.

[4] I 1—422. Except fr. 175, all the fragments appear also in Photius. Zonaras (fr. 118) is a Cyril-glossary with etymological additions.

Bekker's *anecdota*[1]. The earlier condition of the first part of the *συναγωγή* which corresponds to that of the letters *β*—*ω* in Bachmann can be seen in the fragments relating to the letter *a* edited by Boysen from cod. Coislin. 347[2]. An enlarged revision of the original *συναγωγή*, which, with abbreviations and interpolations, was incorporated by the writer of Bekker's sixth lexicon, was one of the chief sources of the well-known lexicon

Photius.

of the Patriarch Photius (*c.* 820—*c.* 891)[3]; but the main constituent has been enriched with numerous additions from other sources, especially Aelius Dionysius, Phrynichus[4], Harpocration, and the lexicons to Homer and Plato. Photius announced that his purpose in contrast with Diogenian was the collection of λέξεις from prose writers, but in practice his quotations from the poets are scarcely less numerous. The lexicon of Photius is preserved only in the Cambridge codex Galeanus (XII cent.), which is seriously mutilated, especially in the earlier part. A certain portion of the early gaps has been supplied (*a*) from the Athenian MS 1083, which contains two short fragments published by Fredrich and Wentzel in 1896[5], and (*b*) from the Berlin MS (cod. Berol. graec. vet. 22) of the late eleventh or early twelfth century, which contains the commencement of the lexicon and extends as far as the gloss *ἄπαρνος*. The latter, so far as it relates to Photius, was published by R. Reitzenstein in 1907 with the title *Der Anfang des Lexicons des Photios*. It has brought to light an extraordinarily rich increment of tragic and comic fragments, no less than 37 of which belong to Sophocles.

Suidas.

The enlarged *συναγωγή* was also incorporated in the lexicon of Suidas (912—959), whose agreement with Photius is explained by their employment of a common source. Suidas, of course,

[1] See p. lxxx3.

[2] *Lexici Segueriani συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων inscripti pars prima ex codice Coisliniano* 347 *edita*, Marburg, 1891.

[3] L. Cohn in Iwan Mueller's *Handbuch*, II p. 699. Reitzenstein, *Photios*, p. XLVI. Observe that the newly recovered opening of Photius is entitled *Κυρίλλου καὶ Φωτίου*.

[4] The recognition of the extent to which Photius was indebted to the *σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή* was one of the chief surprises of the new Photius (Reitz. p. XXXIX). One of the best instances is the gloss *ἀκοῦσαι ὀργῶ*, in which fr. 25 is quoted.

[5] *Nachr. d. Kgl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1896, p. 309 ff. The glosses comprised are *Ἀβραμιαῖος—ἀγάσσει* and *ἀγκιστρεύει—Ἀδράστεια*.

amassed much material of a different character, but we are not concerned with the historical and biographical articles, owing to which his work bears some resemblance to a modern encyclopaedia. He also borrowed many of his glosses on points of grammar and lexicography from the paroemiographers and from the scholia to Aristophanes, Sophocles, and Thucydides[1].

Etymologica.

A few words must be given to the *Etymologica*. The etymological speculations of the Stoics, especially of Chrysippus, were contested by the Alexandrian grammarians of the Roman period, and above all by Philoxenus, a contemporary of Varro[2], and Tryphon, who together developed the formal classification of words as παραγωγαί ranged under their respective πρωτότυπα. The earliest etymological lexicon known to us was compiled by Orion in the first half of the fifth century, and is still partially extant in an abbreviated form. Besides Philoxenus, to whom he clearly owed fr. 621, the predecessors to whom he most frequently refers are Heracleides, Herodian, and Soranus[3]. Several centuries later the reviving interest in classical literature shown by some eminent people, as well as generally by the church, led to the appearance in successive redactions of encyclopaedic collections in which etymology was a leading feature. The oldest of these, now known as the *Etymologicum genuinum* in accordance with the suggestion of its discoverer Prof. R. Reitzenstein, was completed in the first half of the ninth century. It rests on the authority of two MSS of the tenth or eleventh century (cod. Vat. gr. 1818 and cod. Laur. S. Marci 304[4]), but has not been published[5].

[1] The statement may be illustrated from frs. 15, 165, 508, 596, 885. Fr. 507 is interesting, since the gloss appears to come from Phrynichus (*praep. soph.* p. 43. 3 de B.). Fr. 623 is ultimately derived from Aristophanes of Byzantium, to whom all the ancient authorities on μασχαλισμός go back. The fact that Suidas alone mentions the *Troilus* shows that Phot. p. 249. 19 did not completely reproduce his immediate source. The same remark applies to fr. 1101. Fr. 960 perhaps came from the Platonic scholia. The history of fr. 1114 is obscure. [2] See fr. 590.

[3] A physician who belonged to the age of Trajan and Hadrian. The reference is to his ἐπιτομολογίαι τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

[4] This is the *Etym. Flor. Miller.*, from which extracts were published by E. Miller in his *Mélanges*, p. 177.

[5] Some of its readings have been separately published by Reitzenstein (see fr. 704) or communicated by him to others. Hence it has partially ousted the *Etym. M.* in such books as Kaibel's *Com. Gr. Fr.* and Diels's *Vorsokratiker*.

Among its numerous sources may be mentioned Orus, Orion, Herodian *περὶ παθῶν*, and various annotated MSS of classical authors. The *Etymologicum Gudianum*, so called after a former owner of the MS from which the edition of Sturz (1818) was printed, was compiled independently of the *genuinum*, but from similar sources. It appears in three distinct recensions represented by various MSS[1], and has a very complex history which cannot be described here[2]. The *Etymologicum Magnum*, which was edited by Gaisford in 1848, belongs to the early part of the twelfth century. The author took as the basis of his work a copy of the *genuinum*, which he describes as *τὸ μέγα ἐτυμολογικόν*, but he also made use of the *Gudianum* (*τὸ ἄλλο ἐτυμολογικόν*) and a number of additional authorities[3].

Stobaeus.

The most important of all the sources in regard both to the number and to the character of the quotations preserved in it is the *Anthology* of John Stobaeus. His date can only be ascertained by reference to the authorities quoted, of whom Iamblichus is possibly the latest[4]; and, since he also shows no sign of Christian influence, it is unlikely that his collection was put together later than the fourth century. As known to Photius, the work was comprised in four books making two volumes (*τεύχη*)[5]; but owing to disintegration and confusion of its order in the middle ages it was treated as two separate works, distinguished as *eclogae* and *florilegium*. The *eclogae* is actually the first two books, considerably mutilated, of the original *ἀνθολόγιον*, while the third and fourth made up the so-called *florilegium*. The original form of the work, with the correct order of chapters and extracts, so far as it can be restored from the best copies, is only

[1] See fr. 789 (*Etym. Sorb.*), fr. 390 (*Etym. Paris.*).

[2] For further details respecting the chief *Etymologica* see Reitzenstein in Pauly-Wissowa VI 812 ff. It is important to observe that each scribe adds some particulars and alters others, so that the work is continually in flux. The first part of a new edition of the *Etym. Gud.* by Al. de Stefani has recently appeared.

[3] The *Etym. Voss.* (Voss. gr. 20, XIII cent.) occasionally cited by Gaisford contains the so-called *μεγάλη γραμματική*, a reconstruction of yet another *Etymologicum* which passed by the name of Symeon (Reitzenstein, *l.c.* 816).

[4] The supposed quotations from Hierocles the Neoplatonist really belong to Hierocles the Stoic, who lived in the reign of Hadrian (v. Arnim in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 1479).

[5] *Bibl.* cod. 167.

to be found in the recent edition of Wachsmuth and Hense[1]. Those who have followed the present discussion will not need to be assured that Stobaeus did not gather his select passages in the course of his own reading, although he may well have been responsible for the addition of some of the later extracts. He himself often refers to the *Tomaria* of a certain Aristonymus. A conclusive proof that Stobaeus made use of earlier anthologies was given by Diels[2] some forty years ago from the coincidence of his quotations with those which appear in the Christian apology addressed to Autolycus by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (*c.* 180 A.D.)[3]. Exactly the same kind of coincidence has been observed in the case of Clement of Alexandria. Thus, it cannot be due to chance that three quotations on the same topic which appear in the same chapter of Stobaeus, and in close proximity to each other[4], should be cited in immediate sequence by Clement, though one of them is attributed to Aeschylus with a significant addition[5]. But, though the existence of such anthologies is thus brought back to the second century A.D., and by reasonable inference to a much earlier date[6], and, though Plato recommended the making of selections from the poets, so that extracts from their works might be committed to memory as an aid to moral instruction[7], there is no express reference to their composition and no record of the names of their authors.

Only within very recent times has evidence come to light which reveals the tradition represented by Stobaeus as already current at least 600 years before his time. In the *Journal of* Early anthologies

[1] Hense's concluding volume is still unpublished. The references to the vulgate of the *florilegium* have been retained in the present edition as being more generally accessible, but Hense's pages have also been cited.

[2] *Rh. Mus.* XXX 172 ff.

[3] Both assign fr. 229 to Aeschylus as well as to Sophocles. The clearest case is the ascription by Theophilus to Aeschylus as a single quotation of three distinct passages which have run together owing to the loss in the anthology of the lemma belonging to the two latter: see Stob. *ecl.* 1. 3 p. 57, 4 ff. with Wachsmuth's notes. Cf. also frs. 961, 962.

[4] *Flor.* 39. 11, 13, 14.

[5] See on fr. 934. Points of contact between Stobaeus and Clement will be found in frs. 87, 929, 949. On their relation see Wilamowitz, *Einleitung*, p. 171.

[6] Wilamowitz, *l.c.*

[7] Plat. *legg.* 811 A.

Hellenic Studies for 1907[1] F. W. Hasluck published from an inscription, which was found at Kermasti in the Cyzicus district and is dated about 300 B.C., a long list of aphorisms, such as *φίλοις βοήθει, θυμοῦ κράτει, ἄδικα φεῦγε*, and so forth, obviously intended for the moral edification of those who frequented the immediate neighbourhood. When the list is compared with the collection of the precepts of the Seven Wise Men attributed to Sosiades in Stob. *flor.* 3. 80, it is abundantly clear that the former, if not the original, is at any rate an early version of the latter[2]. Even more remarkable in their relation to Stobaeus were the fragments of *florilegia* published in Berl. Klassikertexte, V 2 pp. 123—130, from two papyri (Berl. 9772 and 9773) of the second century B.C. Thus 9773 not only contains the extracts 9 and 11 of Stob. *flor.* 69 next to each other though in the reverse order, but also the title *ψόγος γυναικῶν*, which is prefixed to the same chapter of Stobaeus. Though the text of Stobaeus may thus be shown to depend upon very ancient authority, it cannot be considered to possess the same weight as the text of an extant play which can be traced to the Alexandrian edition. In fact, when a comparison is possible between the two, the differences are often such that they cannot entirely be explained as the deliberate modifications of the anthologist made for the purpose of adapting his quotations to their place. In dealing with the Berlin fragments Wilamowitz suggested that the text of Euripides might have come from a bad actor's copy, while at the same time he pointed out the possibility that the anthology was constituted before the date of Aristophanes' edition[3]. But, whatever the defects of his text, Stobaeus is so precious a witness that one would willingly barter much of the lexicographic material for an increased supply from the anthologies. In this respect Euripides was more fortunate, as has already been mentioned. Apart from Stobaeus and his copyists the only extant authority in this department is the *ἀνθολόγιον γνωμῶν* addressed to the empress Eudocia by the grammarian

[1] XXVII 62 f.

[2] This was first pointed out by Diels in *Sitzungsb. d. k. pr. Akad.* 1907, p. 457. See also *Vorsokr.* II[3] p. 214.

[3] See also his *Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 270.

Orion (*c.* 440 A.D.), which for three fragments stands entirely alone[1].

§ 5. *Bibliography.*

The scholars of the centuries immediately following the revival of learning were occupied with weightier matters than the collection of the scattered remains of the ancient masters, which the nature of the texts then available would have made a task of exceptional difficulty. All the more credit is due to Casaubon for constructing, by way of excursus to Athen. 277 E[2], a catalogue of all the titles of Sophocles' plays of which he could find a record. Bentley once dreamed of the project of editing the fragments of all the Greek poets, and the *Letter to Mill* and the contributions to Graevius's *Callimachus* were foretastes of what he might have accomplished in this sphere. But it was not until the latter part of the eighteenth century that attention began to be directed to those of Sophocles in particular. In 1762 Benjamin Heath (1704—1766) published at the Clarendon Press a series of notes on Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, including (pp. 93—112) critical comments on a number of tragic fragments taken from Grotius's excerpts from Stobaeus[3]. A contribution of a similar kind was made by the well-known philologer Jonathan Toup (1713—1785) in his *Epistola Critica* addressed to Warburton and published in 1767; and in the same year appeared L. C. Valckenaer's *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*, which incidentally discussed several fragments of Sophocles. Valckenaer had in fact devoted much labour to these latter, and it is clear from the Preface of Brunck, their first editor, that the collection contained in his edition of Sophocles (1786) was largely indebted to the Dutch critic. Brunck also acknowledged his obligation to David Ruhnken, by whom a number of quotations was contributed from hitherto

[1] frs. 228, 247, 302. What remains of Orion is only a scanty fragment, which was first edited by Schneidewin from a Vienna MS. It is also printed in Meineke's *Stobaeus* IV 249—266.

[2] It is reproduced in Schweighäuser's *Athenaeus*, IX pp. 27—52.

[3] *Dicta poetarum*, quae in Eclogis tum in Florilegio Stobaeus adfert, recensuit H. Grotius, Paris, 1623.

unedited lexicographical sources. The arrangement of the *editio princeps* was somewhat inconvenient. The plays in alphabetical order with most of the longer fragments attributed to them came first; then more than 100 fragments 'ex incertis tragoediis'; and lastly a number of glosses from the lexicographers arranged alphabetically as 'Lexicon Sophocleum,' and containing complete lines as well as isolated words and phrases. Nevertheless, Brunck's edition, which was reprinted several times, held the field for more than forty years, during which period little was done either for the increase of the collection or for the better understanding of the fragments which had been already printed. Mention should, however, be made of a paper by Blomfield in *Mus. Crit. Cant.* I (1826) 141—149, containing addenda to Brunck's collection and critical notes on several passages. Blomfield's results were incorporated by W. Dindorf, who, in his *Poetae Scenici* of 1830, was able by recasting Brunck's work to issue it in a much more convenient form with various corrections and enlargements. Dindorf acknowledged in his Preface that he had taken slight pains to improve the work by his own investigations, and lamented that there was no prospect of a new edition adequate to the needs of the time. Hasty and superficial as the book was, it shared the popularity which Dindorf's publications enjoyed for about half a century, and in its latest form, as represented in the fifth and greatly improved issue of the *Poetae Scenici* (1869), it is probably still in more general use than any other edition.

A new epoch in the progress of knowledge concerning the literary output of the Greek tragedians was opened by the publication in three volumes of F. G. Welcker's *Die griechische Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet*, Bonn, 1839. This was an exhaustive examination of all the evidence which could be discovered bearing upon the literary history of the plays of the three great tragedians, and especially on the contents of their plots. The plays were arranged according to the order occupied by the events which they comprised in the series of the epic Cycle. Welcker's book is as readable to-day as when it was first printed. He had spared no exertion in sifting the whole of the data provided by the mythographical

authorities, and in comparing them with the relevant indications of the tragic fragments. On the basis of this evidence the plots were reconstructed with remarkable acuteness; and the results, though necessarily often conjectural, can be checked, even where they fail to convince, by the openly displayed material of the sources quoted. It should be added that the satyric plays had been separately treated by Welcker in an earlier work entitled *Nachtrag zu die Aesch. Trilogie Prometheus*, Frankfurt, 1826. Welcker's work gave an extraordinary impulse to philological activity, and the following years witnessed the appearance of a number of critical papers in the various periodicals by Bergk, Meineke, Nauck, Schneidewin, and others, directed to the emendation and elucidation of the tragic texts. The influence of Welcker is more directly visible in editions of the tragic fragments which began to appear in the course of the following decade. This applies to F. H. Bothe's *Poetarum scenicorum Graecorum quorum integra opera supersunt Fragmenta*, Lipsiae, 1844—1846[1], to F. W. Wagner's *Poetarum tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vratislaviae, 1844—1852, and to E. A. I. Ahrens's edition of the fragments of Aeschylus and Sophocles in the Didot series (1842), which was prepared with the avowed object of popularizing Welcker's results. J. A. Hartung's *Sophokles' Fragmente* (1851) was a more ambitious effort upon the same lines, but his speculations, though sometimes ingenious, are seldom such as to command assent.

In 1856 appeared the first edition of A. Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, which was the earliest systematic attempt to produce an edition acceptable to the requirements of modern criticism. His aim was critical rather than explanatory, and one of his chief merits was the provision of accurate information concerning the textual data of the sources. Even where these had not been satisfactorily edited, as was the case with Stobaeus, Nauck succeeded in procuring collations of the material readings of the best MSS. Nauck's second edition, enlarged and revised so as to include the latest available material, appeared in 1889.

[1] In 1806 Bothe published an edition of Sophocles in 2 vols., in which the fragments were reproduced from Brunck. A second edition appeared in 1826. Neither this nor the later work is of much independent value.

and has remained the indispensable foundation of all subsequent work. In the meantime Lewis Campbell had edited the fragments after Nauck in the second volume of his *Sophocles* (1881), excluding those which consist of single words or of very short phrases. Campbell contributed some useful notes, but did little to elucidate the difficulties which the fragments present; and he evidently considered that they did not demand the same measure of careful criticism which he applied to the text of the extant plays.

In the course of the twenty-five years which have elapsed since the appearance of Nauck's second edition a considerable mass of fresh material has accrued, and the extraordinary development of the various branches of Classical learning which has taken place during that period, while it has thrown welcome light on many obscurities, has enormously increased the difficulty of focusing its results so far as they bear upon the scattered texts. There has been no fresh edition of the whole of the fragments; but, since the publication of the papyrus remains of the *Ichneutae* and *Eurypylus* in 1912, a convenient text entitled *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta papyracea nuper reperta* has been edited by A. S. Hunt, and the additions to Sophocles brought to light in recent years have been collected and edited by E. Diehl as *Supplementum Sophocleum*, Bonn, 1913. The *Ichneutae* has been separately edited by N. Terzaghi, Firenze, 1913. There is also a German translation by C. Robert, Berlin [second ed.], 1913. The following list contains all the occasional contributions which have been consulted for the purpose of the present edition, as well as some marked by an asterisk which I have not had an opportunity of examining.

BAKHUYZEN, W. H. VAN DE SANDE. *De parodia in comoediis Aristophanis.* Utrecht, 1877.

BAMBERGER, F. *Conjectaneorum in poetas Graecos capita duo.* Braunschweig, 1841. [Reprinted in his *Opuscula philologica*: see pp. 163–165.]

BENECKE, E. F. M. *Antimachus of Colophon.* London, 1896. [On the *Phaedra* of Sophocles at p. 201.]

BERGK, Th. *Commentatio de fragmentis Sophoclis.* Lipsiae, 1833.

—— *De duodecim fragmentis Sophoclis.* Marburg, 1843/4.

—— *Nachträge zu den Fragmenten des Sophokles.* Zeitschrift für Altertumswissenschaft, XIII (1855), p. 108.

BLASS, F. [On the *Niobe*.] Literarisches Zentralblatt, 1897, p. 334.

—— Rhein. Mus. LV 96–101.

BLAYDES, F. H. M. *Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Halis Saxonum, 1894.

—— *Adversaria in varios poetas Graecos et Latinos.* Halis, 1898. [On Soph. frs. at pp. 158–165, 201.]

—— *Spicilegium Tragicum.* Halis, 1902. [On Soph. frs. pp. 156–163, 243.]

BUCHERER, F. *Zu Sophokles' Ichneutai.* Berl. phil. Woch., 1912, 1107 f.

BUECHELER, Fr. *Coniectanea.* Rhein. Mus. XXXIX 274.

CAMPBELL, L. [Letter in reply to R. Ellis: *v. infra.*] American Journal of Philology, III 128.

COBET, C. G. *Collectanea Critica.* [De nonnullis fragmentis Tragicorum, pp. 187–208.] Lugduni Batavorum, 1878.

CONINGTON, J. *Epistola critica de quibusdam Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis fragmentis.* Oxford, 1852. [Reprinted in *Miscellaneous Writings*, 1872: see II pp. 455–457.]

—— *Ad Tragicos Graecos.* Hermes, II 142 ff.

CRUSIUS, O. *Der Sophokleische Dionysiskos.* Rhein. Mus. XLVIII 153.

DECHARME, P. *Le Drame satyrique sans Satyres.* Revue des Études grecques, XII (1899), pp. 290–299.

DINDORF, W. *Vermischte Aufsatze.* Philologus, XII 188–192.

DOBREE, P. P. *Adversaria.* Cambridge, 1843. II pp. 51–55.

DUENTZER, H. *Zu den Fragmenten des Sophokles.* Philologus, III 136–138.

EBERS, A. *Ueber die Fabel der Aloiden.* Zeitschrift f. Alterthumswissenschaft, IV 785–792.

ELLIS, R. *On the fragments of Sophocles and Euripides.* Journal of Philology, IV 251–271.

—— *On the fragments of Sophocles.* American Journal of Philology, II 411 ff.

—— *Blaydes's Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Hermathena, IX 144–154.

—— *Some emendations of the Greek Tragici.* Classical Review, IX 105.

ENGELMANN, R. *Archaologische Studien zu den Tragikern.* Berlin, 1900.

ENGER, R. *Zu Sophokles* [fr. 88] Rhein. Mus. XXIII 537 ff.

—— *Adnotationes ad Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Ostrovii, 1863.

FOERSTER, R. *Zum Laokoon des Sophokles.* Verhandlungen der 40. Versammlung deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Gorlitz 1889 [pp. 432–438]. Leipzig, 1890.

FRITZSCHE, F. V. *Emendationes in Aristophanis fragmenta. De Sophoclis Niobe.* Ind. lect. acad. Rostochi, 1836.

GERCKE, A. *Telegonie und Odyssee.* Neue Jahrb. f. d. kl. Altertum, XV 313–333.

GOMPERZ, Th. *Zu den gr. Tragikern.* Rhein. Mus. XIII 477 ff.

—— *Beitrage zur Kritik u. Erklarung gr. Schriftsteller* [pp. 4–15] Wien, 1875.

—— *Die Bruchstucke der gr. Tragiker und Cobets neueste kritische Manier.* Wien, 1878.

GOMPERZ, Th. *Nachlese zu den Bruchstücken der gr. Tragiker* [pp. 4–17]. Wien, 1888.

HARRISON, J. E. *Athene Ergane.* Classical Review, VIII 270.

—— *Pandora's Box.* Journal of Hellenic Studies, XX 99 ff.

—— *Sophocles Ichneutae* Col. IX 1–7 *and the δρώμενον of Kyllene and the Satyrs.* Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway [pp. 136–152]. Cambridge, 1913.

HAVERFIELD, F. *A fragment of Sophocles.* Classical Review, II 324.

HAYMAN, H. *Emendations of Sophocles.* Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, 1882, p. 30.

HEADLAM, W. G. *Various Conjectures I.* Journal of Philology, XX 294–311.

—— *Various Conjectures III.* Journal of Philology, XXIII 260–323.

—— *Critical Notes I. Tragicorum fragmenta ed. Nauck.* Classical Review, XIII 3 ff.

—— *Emendations and Explanations.* Journal of Philology, XXXI 8–10.

HEIMSOETH, Fr. *Kritische Studien zu den gr. Tragikern.* Bonn, 1865.

HENSE, O. *Exercitationes Criticae.* Halis, 1868.

HERWERDEN, H. VAN. *Exercitationes Criticae* [pp. 10–30]. Hagae Comitum, 1862.

—— *Emendatur Sophocles ap. Stob. Flor.* 26. 1. Mnemosyne, I 312.

—— *Ad poetas scenicos Graecorum.* Mnem. VI 280–282.

—— *Epistola Critica ad Nauckium.* Mnem. XVII 265–267.

—— *Ad Tragicos.* Mnem. XX 432–434.

—— *Lucubrationes Sophocleae* [pp. 77–83]. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1887.

—— *Analecta Tragica.* Appendix in Eur. *Hel.* [pp. 101–103]. Lugduni Batavorum, 1895.

—— *Ad tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Mélanges Henri Weil [pp. 179–191]. Paris, 1898.

—— *Novae Observationes ad Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Rhein. Mus. LVIII 138.

—— *Varia ad Varios.* Mnem. XXVII 390.

HILLER, E. *De Sophoclis Phaedra et de Euripidis Hippolyto priore.* Liber miscell. philol. Bonn, 1864. p. 34 ff.

HILLER V. GAERTRINGEN, F. *De Graecorum fabulis ad Thraces pertinentibus.* Berlin, 1886.

HOLLAND, R. *Die Sage von Daidalos und Ikaros.* Progr. der Thomasschule in Leipzig, 1902.

HOLZNER, E. *Zu den Fragmenten des Sophokles.* Wiener Studien, XVI 324–328.

—— *Zu den Fragmenten der griech. Tragiker.* Philologus, LV 566–568.

IMMISCH, O. *Ad Sophoclis Epigonos.* Philologus, XLVIII 554.

—— *Klaros* [p. 180 ff.]. Jahrb. für cl. Philologie, Suppl. Bd XVII.

—— *Ein Sophokleischer Vers* [fr. 768] *und das Urtheil über Clitarchs Stil in der Schrift vom Erhabenen.* Rhein. Mus. XLVIII 512–528.

JEBB, R. C. *Adversaria in Sophoclis fragmenta* [p. 121 f.]. Album Gratulatorium in honorem Henrici van Herwerden. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1902.

KALKMANN, A. *De Hippolytis Euripidis quaestiones novae.* Bonn, 1882.

KEIL, H. *Sophokles* [fr. 432]. Philologus, I 157 ff.

KNAACK, G. *Charnabon.* Neue Jahrb. für Philologie, CXXXV 318, 800.

KOCK, Th. *Verisimilia.* Jahrb. für cl. Philologie, Suppl. Bd VI.

*KRAMER, A. *De Pelopis fabula.* Diss. Halle, 1886.

KURFESS, A. *De Sophoclis Indagatorum fontibus.* Mnem. XLI 111 f.

LUDWICH, A. *Zu Herakleitos Homerischen Allegoricen. Mit einem Anhang zu gr. Dichtern* [Soph. fr. 391]. Rhein. Mus. XXXVII 434 ff.

—— [On Soph. fr. 812.] Berl. phil. Woch., 1902, 766.

MAAS, P. *Zu den neuen Klassikertexten der Oxyrhynchos-Papyri* (vol. IX). Berl. phil. Woch., 1912, 1075 ff.

—— Review of Hunt's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea.* Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung, 1912, 2781–2785.

MADVIG, J. N. *Emendationes per saturam.* Philologus, I 670–677 [Reprinted in *Opusc. acad.* p. 699 ff.].

—— *Fragmenta aliquot poetarum Graecorum quae apud Athenaeum exstant emendata.* Mélanges Graux, Paris, 1884, pp. 71–78.

MARX, Fr. *Die Zeit der Schrift vom Erhabenen.* Wiener Studien, XX 169 ff. at p. 191 ff.

MAYER, M. *Mythistorica.* 3 *Tereus.* Hermes, XXVII 489 ff.

MEINEKE, A. *Marginalien.* Zeitschrift für Alterthumswissenschaft, I 293, ibid. III 1066, VIII 500.

—— *Zu den Fragmenten des Sophokles.* Philologus, XIX 144.

—— *Miscellanea.* Neue Jahrb. für Philologie, LXXXVII 369 ff.

—— *Miscellen.* Philologus, XVII 558.

MEKLER, S. *Lectionum Graecarum specimen* [fr. 88]. Wien, 1882.

—— *παντοναίτης* [fr. 555]. Philologus, LIV 376.

—— *Lucubrationum capita quinque* [fr. 432]. Progr. des Communal-Obergymn. im 19. Bezirke. Wien, 1895.

—— *Exegetisch-kritische Beiträge zu den Fragmenten der griech. Tragiker.* Jahresb. d. Elisabeth-Gymnasiums in Wien, 1903.

—— *Bericht über die die griech. Tragiker betreffende Literatur der Jahre* 1898–1902. Bursians Jahresbericht, CXXV 180–184, CXXIX 29–32.

—— *Bericht über die die griech. Tragiker betreffende Literatur der Jahre* 1903–1907. Bursians Jahresbericht, CXLVII 95–123, 277 ff.

MÜNSCHER, K. *Zu Sophokles Ichneutae.* Rhein. Mus. LXIX 170–190.

NABER, S. A. *Sophoclea.* Mnem. IX pp. 241–244.

NAUCK[1], A. *Zu den Fragmenten der griech. Tragiker.* Philologus, IV 538–543

—— *Zu den Fragmenten der griech. Tragiker.* Philologus, VI 384–401.

—— *Zu den Fragmenten der griech. Tragiker.* Philologus, XII 193–196.

*—— *Observationes criticae de tragicorum Graecorum fragmentis.* Progr. Gymn. Joachim. Berolini, 1855.

[1] This is not a complete list of his published work on the Fragments; but, since his latest results are to be found in his second edition, it did not seem worth while to refer to all the scattered publications, which are partly superseded and often difficult of access.

NAUCK, A. *Zur Kritik griechischer Dichter.* Neue Jahrb. für cl. Philologie, CV 803–807.

—— *Tragicae dictionis index spectans ad Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta.* Petropoli, 1892. [The book contains an important supplement to the edition of the text: see especially pp. XI–XIV.]

*NEUMANN, W. *Die Entwickelung des Philoktet-Mythos mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Behandlung durch Sophokles.* Progr. des Gymn. Coburg, 1893.

PAPABASILEIOS, G. A. διόρθωσις χωρίων Σοφοκλέους κτέ. Παρνασσός, X 513.

—— κριτικαὶ παρατηρήσεις εἰς τὰ ἀποσπάσματα τῶν τραγικῶν. Ἀθηνᾶ, VI 65–73.

PAPAGEORGIUS, P. N. κριτικὰ καὶ ἑρμηνευτικὰ εἰς τὰ ἀποσπάσματα τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν τραγικῶν ποιητῶν. Lipsiae, 1880.

—— διορθώσεις εἰς τὰ ἀποσπάσματα τῶν τραγικῶν ποιητῶν. Ἀθήναιον, IX 333 ff., 341 ff.

—— *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Sophokles.* Pars I. Jenae, 1883.

*PAUCKER, C. *Doppelpalladienraub nach den Laconerinnen des Soph. auf einer Vase von Armento.* Mitau, 1851.

PEARSON, A. C. *Notes on Sophocles, Ichneutae and Eurypylus.* Classical Review, XXVI 209–212.

—— Αἰτναῖος κάνθαρος. Classical Review, XXVIII 223 f.

*PEPPMUELLER, R. *In poetas Graecos* [Soph. fr. 126]. Progr. d. Gymn. Seehausen i. A. Halle, 1887.

PETERSEN, E. *Andromeda.* Journal of Hellenic Studies, XXIV 104–112.

*—— *Atreus und Thyestes nach Sophocles.* Progr. Dorpat, 1877.

*PFLUGK, J. *Schedae criticae.* [In Sophocles *Iphigeniam.*] Gedani, 1835.

PILLING, C. *Quomodo Telephi fabulam et scriptores et artifices veteres tractaverint.* Halae Saxonum, 1886.

PORSON, R. *Adversaria* [p. 215 f.]. Cantabrigiae, 1812.

POWELL, J. U. *On Recent Discoveries.* Classical Quarterly, IX 142 f.

RABE, H. *Lexicon Messanense de iota ascripto.* Rhein. Mus. XLVII 404–413.

REITZENSTEIN, R. *Inedita poetarum Graecarum fragmenta* I, II. Ind. lect. acad. Rostoch., 1890/1, 1891/2.

RIBBECK, O. *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik.* Leipzig, 1875.

RIZZO, G. E. *Studi archeologici sulla tragedia et sul ditirambo.* Riv. di filologia classica, XXX 462 ff.

—— *Theaterdarstellung und Tragödienszene.* Jahreshefte des Österr. Archäol. Instituts, VIII 824.

ROBERT, K. *Bild und Lied* [vol. V of *Philologische Untersuchungen*: Kiessling u. Wilamowitz]. Berlin, 1881.

—— *Niobe auf einem pompejanischen Marmorbild.* Hermes, XXXVI 368–387. [Revised and separately published: Hallisches Winckelmanns programm, 1903.]

—— *Der pergamenische Fries.* Jahrb. d. Deutsch. Archäol. Instituts, II 246 ff.; *ibid.* III 61 ff.

—— *Aphoristische Bemerkungen zu Sophokles' Ἰχνευταί.* Hermes, XLVII 536–561.

ROBERT, K. *Pandora.* Hermes, XLIX 17–38.

ROSSBACH, O. *Bemerkungen zu griechischen Papyri.* Berl. philol. Woch., 1912, 1460 f.

*ROSTAGNI, A. *L'Euripilo di Sophocle ed un frammento epico adespoto.* Bollettino di filologia class., XIX 156 ff.

RUEHL, F. *Vermischte Bemerkungen.* Neue Jahrb. für Philol., CXVII 315.

SCHENKL, H. *Zu den Ἰχνευταί des Sophokles.* Hermes, XLVIII 153–156.

SCHMIDT, F. W. *Kritische Studien zu den griech. Dramatikern.* [See especially I pp. 247–282.] Berlin, 1886.

SCHMIDT, M. *Variae Lectiones.* Philologus, VII 749.

—— —— *Vermischtes.* Philologus, VIII 112.

—— [From an elaborate review of Nauck's first edition.] Zeitschrift für Alterthumswissenschaft, XIV 534–547.

—— *Zu den gr. Dramatikern.* Philologus, XII 748 ff.

—— *Kritische Bemerkungen.* Philologus, XVIII 229 f.

—— *Verbesserungsvorschläge zu schwierigen Stellen griech. Schriftsteller.* Rhein. Mus. XXVI 207–218.

SCHNEIDEWIN, F. W. *Conjectanea Critica.* Göttingen, 1839. [*Spicilegium fragmentorum Sophocleorum*, at p. 98 ff.]

—— *Lanx Satura.* Rhein. Mus., II 296 f.

—— *Sophokles Tereus* [fr. 583]. Philologus, II 755.

—— *Ueber Soph. Aletes* fr. 241 [fr. 646]. Philologus, III 89.

—— *Ueber Soph. Tyro.* Philologus, III 168.

SCHNEIDEWIN, O. [On Soph. fr. 567.] Zeitschrift für d. Alterthumswissenschaft, VII 1275 f.

SCHROEDER, P. *Zu Sophokles Phaidra.* Neue Jahrb. f. Philol., CXXI 408.

SEYFFERT, M. *Zu den Fragmenten d. gr. Tragiker von A. Nauck.* Rhein. Mus. XV 614 ff.

STAHL, J. M. *Zu den Ἰχνευταί des Sophokles.* Rhein. Mus. LXVIII 307 ff.

THRAEMER, Ed. *Pergamos.* Leipzig, 1888.

TUCKER, T. G. *Adversaria upon the Fragments of Sophocles.* Class. Rev., XVII 189–191.

—— *Further Adversaria upon the Fragments of Sophocles.* Class. Rev., XVIII 245 f.

*VALGIMIGLI, M. [On the Ἰχνευταί of Sophocles.] Athenaeum (Pavia), vol. I, part 4 (1913).

VATER, Fr. *Die Alcaden des Sophokles.* Berlin, 1835.

—— *Miscellaneorum criticorum fasciculus tertius.* Neue Jahrb. f. Philol., Suppl. Bd XVII pp. 165–209.

VILJOEN, H. G. *Sophocles' Electra* 1074 *sqq.* [Contains several notes on *Ichneutae.*] Classical Quarterly, X 1–6.

VITELLI, G. [On fr. 679.] Mélanges Graux, p. 99.

—— [On fr. 85.] Studi Ital. di filolog. class., 1894, p. 298.

VOLLGRAFF, W. *Ad Sophoclis Indagatores.* Mnemosyne, XLII 81–90, 165–177.

VURTHEIM, J. *De Eugammonis Telegonia.* Mnemosyne, XXIX 23–58.

WAGENER, A. *Un vers de Sophocle.* Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique, XXXII 171 f.

WAGNER, F. W. *Zu Sophokles.* Rhein. Mus. VII 149 f.

—— *Kritische Aehrenlese.* Zeitschrift für d. Alterthumswissenschaft, X 15 f., 412–414.

—— *Niobe von Sophocles.* Ibid. IV (1837), nr 12.

WAGNER, R. *Epitoma vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca. Accedunt curae mythographae de Ap. fontibus*, etc. Lipsiae, 1891.

WECKLEIN, N. *Ars Sophoclis emendandi.* Wirceburgi, 1869.

—— [Review of Papageorgius, *op. cit.*] Philol. Anzeiger, XI 18 ff.

—— *Zu gr. Schriftstellern.* Rhein. Mus. XXXVI 141.

—— *Zu den Fragmenten des Sophokles.* Rhein. Mus. XXXVIII 136 f.

—— *Ueber die Textueberlieferung d. Aeschylos u. anderer gr. Tragiker.* Sitzungsb. d. Kgl. bayr. Akad. d. Wissensch., 1888, II 327–374 [pp. 356–358].

—— *Dramatisches u. kritisches zu den Fragmenten d. gr. Tragiker.* Sitzungsb. 1890, I 1–57.

—— *Zu Sophokles.* Neue Jahrb. f. Philol., CXLV 238.

—— *Ueber die dramatische Behandlung des Telephosmythus u. über die Dramen* Ὀστολόγοι, Κάβιροι, Σύνδειπνοι. München, 1909.

—— *Zu den* Ἰχνευταί *des Sophokles.* Bl. f. bayer. Gymn. 1913, 437.

WEIL, H. *Sur quelques fragments de Sophocle.* Revue des études grecques, III 339–348.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON. *De tragicorum Graecorum fragmentis.* Gottingae, 1893.

—— *Die Spürhunde des Sophokles.* Neue Jahrb. f. d. Klass. Altertum, XXIX 449–476.

—— *Einleitung in die gr. Tragödie.* Berlin, 1907. [Reprint from first edition of *Euripides, Herakles* (1889).]

WOLFF, G. *Kritische Bemerkungen.* Philologus, XVI 527.

—— *Zu Sophokles.* Philologus, XXVIII 543 f.

WORDSWORTH, Chr. *Conjectural emendations.* London, 1883.

ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ

ΑΘΑΜΑΣ Α AND Β

There are two famous stories connected with the name of Athamas, which are recorded by our authorities with great variety of detail. One of these, the escape of Phrixus and Helle, was the starting-point of the Argonautic saga; and, though the evidence of the tragedians is the earliest to which we can now appeal, it must have been related in the lost epics. Athamas, king of Thebes, by his union with Nephele, an immortal, had two children, Phrixus and Helle. He subsequently married Ino, who bore to him Learchus and Melicertes. Ino was jealous of the children of Nephele, and, when a drought occurred—produced, according to one version, by the cunning of Ino herself—she bribed the messengers who were sent by Athamas to consult the oracle at Delphi, and persuaded them to give a false report. They accordingly announced that the god required the sacrifice of Phrixus as an expiation. Athamas was obliged against his will to consent, but Nephele succeeded in saving her children by means of a ram with a golden fleece, which Hermes gave to her. This ram, placed among the flocks of Athamas, was not only endowed with the power of speech, so that it was able to warn Phrixus of his impending danger, but also rescued him and his sister by taking them on its back, and flying away with them across the sea. Helle, unable to keep her seat, fell into the sea, and gave her name to the Hellespont; but Phrixus escaped to Colchis, where he sacrificed the ram and presented its fleece to Aeetes. Such is the general tenor of the more or less discrepant versions of Apollod. 1. 80—83, Philosteph. fr. 37 (*FHG* III 31), schol. rec. Aesch. *Pers.* 71, Zenob. 4. 38 and others; and there is some reason for supposing that Euripides made these events the basis of his *Phrixus* (*TGF*, p. 626), possibly with some of the variations recorded by Hygin. *fab.* 2.

Sophocles wrote two plays entitled *Athamas*, and, although the fragments preserved are almost entirely insignificant, we have direct evidence that one of them was concerned with a version of the story given above. But the central incident in

Sophocles was not the rescue of Phrixus, but the subsequent fate of Athamas. This appears from schol. V Ar. *Nub.* 257 (*ὥσπερ με τὸν Ἀθάμανθ' ὅπως μὴ θύσετε*) *τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον Ἀθάμαντα Σοφοκλέους ἀποτεινόμενος λέγει. ὁ γάρ τοι Σοφοκλῆς πεποίηκε τὸν Ἀθάμαντα ἐστεφανωμένον καὶ παρεστῶτα τῷ βωμῷ τοῦ Διὸς ὡς σφαγιασθησόμενον, καὶ μέλλοντος* (*-τα* cod.) *ἀποσφάττεσθαι αὐτοῦ παραγενόμενον Ἡρακλέα, καὶ* [*τὸν*] *τοῦτον θανάτου ῥυόμενον.* The recent scholia, partly reproduced in Apostol. 11. 58 (*Paroem.* II 529 f.) under the lemma *μὴ θεᾶς ἄνθρωπον ὡς Ἀθάμας*, add (1) that the punishment of Athamas was brought about by Nephele on account of his conduct to her children; (2) that Heracles saved Athamas by announcing that Phrixus was alive. The latter point is also mentioned in Suid. *s.v.* *Ἀθάμας*, who omits the reference to Sophocles. The rejoinder of schol. R, to which some critics have attached too much importance, is merely an ignorant objection: *ὡς ἄγροικος Ἀθάμαντα εἶπεν ἀντὶ Φρίξου· ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὸν Φρίξον τὸν Ἀθάμαντα εἶπεν ὡς ἄγροικος ἀγνοῶν τὰς ἱστορίας· οὐ γὰρ Ἀθάμας ἐφο<νεύθη>, ἀλλὰ Φρίξος.* For the tradition that Athamas was sacrificed does not depend upon this evidence alone, but is recorded as a local legend, which was current at Alos in Thessaly, by Hdt. 7. 197. His narrative is not at all clear, but so much at least is germane to the present discussion, that Athamas was sacrificed *καθαρμὸν τῆς χώρης ποιευμένων Ἀχαιῶν ἐκ θεοπροπίου*, and that Cytissorus the son of Phrixus arrived from Colchis and rescued him. Several questions will at once suggest themselves in reference to the dramatic treatment which Sophocles may have applied to this material, but to most of them no answer is possible. It is, however, a legitimate observation that the means by which Nephele compassed the sacrifice of Athamas, together with the arrival of Heracles, the delivery of his message, and the release of Athamas, were amply sufficient to occupy the whole of the action. I infer that the history of the plot against Phrixus, with all its *ἄλογα*, although *ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν*, to use Aristotle's language (*poet.* 15. 1454^{b} 7), was nevertheless *ἔξω τῆς τραγῳδίας*. It seems to follow that Athamas must have supposed Phrixus to be dead, although he was not slain at the altar; and, since Helle actually perished, that she cannot have been included in the design aimed at her brother. The religious questions connected with the sacrifice of Athamas, which are discussed by Frazer (*Pausan.* V p. 172) and others, do not concern us here. The date of this play must have been earlier than B.C. 423.

In the other story mentioned above Athamas was the apparently innocent victim of the wrath of Hera. She afflicted

him with madness, because Hermes by the command of Zeus had given Dionysus to Ino and Athamas to be reared as a girl: see Hygin. *fab.* 5, Apollod. 1. 84. 3. 28, Pausan. 1. 44. 7. The result was that Athamas, believing that he was hunting on Cithaeron, mistook his elder son Learchus for a lion (or a stag) and killed him with his spear; and that Ino, distraught with frenzy and grief, took the other child Melicertes in her arms and threw herself into the sea. Hence the proverb Ἰνοῦς ἄχη in Zenob. 4. 38 and Horace's *flebilis Ino* (*A.P.* 123). The story can be traced to Pherecydes (Schol. Hom. Σ 486: *FHG* I 84); and Seeliger (in Roscher I 670), and more doubtfully Escher (in Pauly-Wissowa II 1931), identify it as the subject of the second play of Sophocles[1]. Apart from the general probabilities of the case, it is possible that frs. 2 and 9 refer to the delusion of Athamas. Ov. *Met.* 4. 420 ff. elaborates this version of the story in his usual manner, but the following touches (512 ff.) appear to be taken from his Greek models: *protinus Aeolides medio furibundus in aula | clamat 'io, comites, his retia tendite silvis!' | hic modo cum gemina visa est mihi prole leaena.* See fr. 2 and Tr. fr. adesp. 1 βοναζούσης λεαίνης, which may just as well belong to Sophocles as to Aeschylus. Cf. Plut. *de superst.* 5. p 167 c ὁ δ' Ἀθάμας μείζονι (*sc.* ἐχρῆτο δυστυχίᾳ) καὶ ἡ Ἀγαυὴ βλέποντες (*sc.* τὰ τέκνα *vel* τοὺς συνήθεις) ὡς λέοντας καὶ ἐλάφους. There is nothing to show whether Athamas used his bow (Stat. *Theb.* 1. 12), or whether the scene was inside the house, as in Ovid, or on the mountain side (Stat. *Theb.* 3. 186), unless indeed ἔπιπλα fr. 8 has any significance. Further, as Welcker has observed, fr. 4 suits the final plight of Athamas restored to his senses and realising the extent of his losses. This would precede his withdrawal to another country, for which cf. Apollod. 1. 84. But none of these indications are so strong as that of fr. 5, where we can hardly fail to see an allusion to the miraculous power of Dionysus. Unless then the reference to the influence of the god is to be explained by his nurture in the palace of Athamas (cf. Lucian *dial. mar.* 9. 1), it would seem that in this play, as in the *Ino* of Euripides (Hygin *fab.* 4), the wife of Athamas had joined the Maenads to share their mystic worship on the hills. It is generally believed that in that play Euripides introduced the story of Themisto, the third wife of Athamas, who plotted against the children of Ino as cruelly and as unsuccessfully as Ino had plotted against those of Nephele. There is nothing to connect Sophocles with this story, although the name of Themisto was freely used by later writers as the

[1] Ahrens suggests that Cic. *haruisp. resp.* 39 *illa exsultatio Athamantis*, which follows a reference to tragedies, may be an allusion to the play of Sophocles.

cause of the ruin of Athamas' household: see Athen. 560 D, Westermann *Mythogr.* p. 345. The evidence which connects the play with the Dionysus-motive is clear enough, and allusions to the madness of Athamas and to the final catastrophe may fairly be inferred; but beyond this we cannot go. There is nothing to show that the fragments of Accius' *Athamas* can be legitimately used to elucidate the plot of Sophocles[1].

It should be observed that the progress of the Athamas-legend shows the gradual combination of at least three stories, which were originally entirely distinct, and belonged to different localities. The subject cannot be pursued here; but an illustration may be given from the fragment of Philostephanus (Schol. AD Hom. H 86, cf. Pausan. 1. 44. 7), the pupil of Callimachus, who omits the Bacchic influence entirely, and attributes the death of Learchus to the retribution exacted by Athamas for Ino's treachery.

See also Introductory Note to the *Phrixus*.

Dindorf held that 'Αθάμας α' and β' were not separate plays, but different editions of the same play. He applies the same principle to other similar cases, but in the absence of specific evidence of revision the presumption is strongly against him.

1

καταγνῶναι

1 Hesych. II p. 421 καταγνῶναι· ἐπιγνῶναι, μέμψασθαι. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι α'.

A few lines before Hesych. has the gloss καταγινώσκω· μέμφομαι. ἐπιγνῶναι is added as an explanation, because the sense 'to find out' was common in later Greek: see *e.g.* Plut. *Philop.* 12 ἐπιγνωσθείσης τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς. Thus καταγιγνώσκω is, as observed by Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 46 οὗτος καταγνοὺς τοῦ γέροντος τοὺς τρόπους, 'to find out to another's detriment,' with various constructions. A good example is Thuc. 7. 51 κατεγνωκότων ἤδη μηκέτι κρεισσόνων εἶναι, where the inf. takes the place of the acc. of the thing. It should be observed that καταγιγνώσκω occasionally appears without the innuendo, being precisely equivalent to ἐπιγιγνώσκω: Xen. *Oec.* 2. 18 καὶ θᾶττον καὶ ῥᾷον καὶ κερδαλεώτερον κατέγνων πράττοντας.

2

ἔρκεσι

2 Hesych. II p. 192 ἔρκεσι· δικτύοις. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι β'. The same gloss occurs in Phot. *lex.* p. 14, 12 without the name of author or play.

Cf. *Etym. M.* p. 375, 10 ἔρκος...σημαίνει καὶ τὰ δίκτυα ὡς τό ὅτε δὴ παρὰ λίνου ἔρκει ἐνιπλήξωσι (a confused quotation of Hom. χ 468). The same sense occurs in fr. 431, Ar. *Av.* 528 ἔρκη, νεφέλας, δίκτυα, πηκτάς, Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 80 φελλὸς ὥς ὑπὲρ ἔρκος. For a possible explanation of the allusion see Introductory Note.

[1] The conjectures that have been made as to Accius' sources are mutually destructive. It is now thought (Escher in Pauly-Wissowa II 1933) that his play comprised the material of Hygin. *poet. astr.* 2. 20, which Sophocles may have used in the *Phrixus*.

3

ἐψία

3 Hesych. II p. 249 ἐψία· γέλως, παιδιά, χλεύη. ἔφοδος· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἕπεσθαι. ὁμιλία. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι δευτέρῳ.

Outside the lexicographers, the word seems only to occur in Nic. *Ther.* 880 σπέρμ' ὀλοὸν κνίδης, ἤθ' ἐψίη ἔπλετο κούροις, where the schol. explains it by παίγνιον. The verb ἐψιᾶσθαι, with its compounds ἐφ- καθ- and ἀφεψιᾶσθαι (fr. 138), is somewhat more common. There are also to be taken into account the gloss ἀψίαι· ἑορταί. Λάκωνες (Hesych. I p. 347) and the compounds φιλεψιος (a proper name in Ar. *Plut.* 177, where see schol.), προσεψιά (Hesych.). The history of this obscure and obsolete word was much canvassed by the grammarians, although there is a general agreement as to its meaning ('amusement'). The authority whom Hesychius follows derived it from ἕπεσθαι tracing the transition (ἔφοδος) of the meaning to παιδιά by way of ὁμιλία: for the transferred sense of ἔφοδος (= *means of passing*), not clearly recognised by L. and S., see Plut. *mor.* 1055 F, Diog. L. 6. 31. There was, however, some wavering as to the breathing; and on this account an alternative derivation from ἔπος was propounded: schol. Ap. Rhod. 1. 459 ἐψιόωνται. παρὰ τὴν ἐψίαν, ἥ ἐστι διὰ λόγων παιδιά· οἷον ἐπεσία τις οὖσα· παρὰ τὸ ἔπος. διὸ καὶ ψιλοῦται, ὁτὲ δὲ δασύνεται, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκολουθοῦσιν. So φιλέψιος was distinguished as meaning φιλοπαίγμων or φιλόλογος, according as the second syllable was or was not aspirated (*Etym. M.* p. 406, 8, Suid. *s.v.* ἐψία). Some modern scholars have favoured the view that ἐ- is prothetic, and that the word is to be connected with ψιάδδοντι = *ludunt*, in Ar. *Lys.* 1302: this was adopted by Curtius (*G. E.* II p. 394 E. tr.), who however forbore to speculate on the derivation. Lobeck's (*Path. El.* I 52) notion that ἐψία was 'a game played *with pebbles*' rests on the assumption that ψια was another form of στία. Monro on Hom. *p* 530 takes an entirely different line, holding that ἐψιάομαι 'implies a noun ἕψις, from a root ἐπ-, Indog. *ieq.* seen in Lat. *iocus*.'

4

ὡς ὢν ἄπαις τε κἀγύναιξ κἀνέστιος

4 Choerob. *in Theod.* p. 307, 15 [= p. 289, 25 Hilgard] (Bekk. *anecd.* p. 1304) τὸ γύναιξ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀρσενικοῦ γένους εἶναι. ἐν δὲ τῇ συνθέσει ἐπειδὴ γίνεται ἀρσενικοῦ γένους, ἀναδέχεται τὴν εἰς αιξ καταλήξιν, οἷον 'ὡς ὢν ἄπαις ἀνέστιος' παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἀθάμαντι.—**ἀγύναιξ.** Cf. Poll. 3. 48 Ἀριστοφάνης (fr. 735 I 569 K.) δὲ τὸν ἀγύνην ἄγυνον, Φρύνιχος (fr. 19 I 376 K.) δὲ 'τηλικουτοσὶ γέρων ἄπαις ἀγύναικος.' The forms καλλιγύναικα, ὀρσιγύναικα, φιλογύναικες, ἡμιγύναικα and the like have no nominative in existence, as was pointed out by Lobeck on Phryn. pp. 185, 659.—**ἀνέστιος** was no doubt borrowed from Hom. I 63 ἀφρήτωρ, ἀθέμιστος, ἀνέστιος ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος, | ὃς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος. Our *homelessness* gives the general idea; for πατρῴα ἑστία was the sacred centre point of family life (Eur. *Alc.* 737).

5

οἴνῳ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀχελῷος ἆρα νᾷ.

5 παρ' H.: γὰρ cod. | ἀχελῶιοι ἄρα cod.

5 *Lex. Messan.* f. 280 sq. (*Rh. Mus.* xlvii 405 ff.) νᾶι σὺν τῷ ἰ μιᾷ συλλαβῇ Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι (ἀθάνατ. cod.: corr. Rabe) 'οἴνωι γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀχελῶιοι ἄρα νᾶι.' H. wrote: 'As the passage is expressly quoted for the use of νᾷ, I do not know why Nauck should have shrunk from writing ἆρα. But in that case γὰρ ἡμῖν must be wrong, and should probably be replaced by παρ' ἡμῖν (ὑμῖν).' The

inferential use of ἄρα (for ἄρα) is clearly seen in *O. C.* 409, 858, and may be taken to be established: see on fr. 931, Eur. *Hclid.* 895. Mekler (*Eranos Vindob.* p. 208) conjectured ἀδρὰ νᾷ.—The verse refers to the miraculous draughts of wine provided by Dionysus for his votaries: Eur. *Bacch.* 143 ῥεῖ δὲ γάλακτι πέδον, ῥεῖ δ' οἴνῳ. *ib.* 707 καὶ τῇδε κρήνην ἐξανῆκ' οἴνου θεός. Such an allusion accords well enough with the story of Ino: Hygin. *fab.* 4 *postea resciit Inonem in Parnasso esse, quae* (*quam* Muncker) *bacchationis causa eo pervenisse.* Nonn. 9. 247 ff. Cf. also Eur. *Bacch.* 229, *Med.* 1284. Thus, Ἀχελῷος is used for *water*, as in Eur. *Bacch.* 625 δμωσὶν Ἀχελῷον φέρειν | ἐννέπων, and elsewhere.—**νᾷ**: for derivatives from this root cf. fr. 270 νᾶτορ, fr. 621 ναρά.

6

λευκὴν ἡμέραν

6 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 106, 33 λευκὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἀγαθήν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι. Cf. Phot. *lex.* p. 217, 5 λευκὴ ἡμέρα· ἡ ἀγαθή. καὶ ἐπ' εὐφροσύνῃ. Εὔπολις Κόλαξι (fr. 174 I 306 K.). The same occurs in Suid. *s.v.*, and in some MSS Σοφοκλῆς is substituted for Εὔπολις Κόλαξι; but *Ai.* 672 f. follow immediately. Zenob. 6. 13 (*Paroem.* I 165) καὶ Μένανδρος δέ φησιν ἐν Λευκαδίῳ (fr. 315 III 90 K.) τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἡμέραν λευκὴν καλεῖσθαι. Herodian. *Philet.* (in Moeris ed. Pierson, p. 477) λευκὴν ἡμέραν διαγαγεῖν, τὴν ἡδεῖαν καὶ ἱλαράν.

'λευκὴ ἡμέρα, *lucida* (Eur. *I. A.* 156 λευκαίνει τόδε φῶς ἤδη λάμπουσ' Ἠώς), λευκόπωλος, λευκόπεπλος, meant properly the silvery grey of dawn in contrast to the night (Aesch. *Ag.* 673 ἔπειτα δ' ἄϋδην πάντιον πεφευγότες, | λευκὸν κατ' ἦμαρ κτέ.), and so might be said metaphorically of relief, cheer, comfort, as in *Pers.* 304 ἐμοῖς μὲν εἶπας δώμασιν φάος μέγα, | καὶ λευκὸν ἦμαρ νυκτὸς ἐκ μελαγχίμου: this is how Sophocles may have used it.' (H.) So λευκὸν εὐάμερον φάος in *Ai.* 708. λευκὴ ἡμέρα is used proverbially much as we say 'a red-letter day' in Eunap. fr. 28 Boiss., Aristaen. 1. 12. The purpose of the grammarians was to mark the metaphorical usage, which is found also in Latin: Catull. 8. 3 *fulsere quondam candidi tibi soles*, as contrasted with Hor. *Sat.* 1. 9. 72 *huncine solem tam nigrum surrexe mihi!* There is no need to seek for any artificial explanation, such as that which Suidas (*s.vv.* λευκὴ ἡμέρα, τῶν εἰς φαρέτραν) quotes from Philarchus (*FHG* I 355), based on an alleged custom of the Scythians to put a white stone into their quiver at night-time for a day spent happily, or a black in the other event. Plin. *n. h.* 7. 40 tells a similar story of the Thracians, and some such practice is alluded to in Hor. *C.* 1. 36. 10, Pers. 2. 1, Catull. 68. 148. Plin. *ep.* 6. 11. Plutarch gives another explanation, relating that Pericles during the blockade of Samos allowed such of his soldiers as drew by lot a white bean to be relieved from discipline and enjoy themselves as they pleased: διὸ καὶ φασι τοὺς ἐν εὐπαθείαις τισὶ γιγνομένους λευκὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ἀπὸ τοῦ λευκοῦ κυάμου προσαγορεύειν (*Per.* 27). Is it merely a coincidence that Eupolis in the Κόλακες referred to this siege (fr. 154 I 299 K.)? Horace speaks of *Genius* as *albus et ater* (*Ep.* 2. 2. 189), *i.e.* εὐδαίμων or the reverse.

7

ἀγχήρης

7 Hesych. I p. 36 ἀγχήρης (ἀγχηρήνης cod.) ὁ ἐγγύς. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι. The correct reading is preserved in *Etym. M.* p. 15, 33 ἀγχήρης· ἐγγύς.

The termination, usually connected with ἀραρίσκω, is the same as that found in τριήρης, ποδήρης, κατήρης, πλειστήρης, μεσήρης, τυμβήρης, κισσήρης, τειχήρης, πυργήρης, ἀμφήρης and others. The history of some of these words is not free from doubt, but the force of *-ηρης* as an element of composition seems to have been reduced, so that in the time of the tragedians it had become productive as a merely adjectival suffix. See also Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 243.

8

ἔπιπλα

8 Harpocr. *s.v.* ἔπιπλον p. 82, 10 τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν σκεύη ἔπιπλα λέγουσι, τὴν οἷον ἐπιπόλαιον κτῆσιν καὶ μετακομίζεσθαι δυναμένην. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι (so Casaubon for ἀκάμαντι). Hesych. II p. 164 goes more into detail: ἔπιπλα· ἱμάτια γυναικεῖα, ἢ χρήματα, ἢ σκεύη, τὰ μὴ ἔγγεια, ἀλλ' ἐπιπόλαια. Suidas, who has three separate glosses on the word, is much to the same effect, but gives alternative derivations from ἐπίπλεα or δυνατὴ πλοίζεσθαι ('to be put on board'). The word means *movables*; but it is an elastic term, and is sometimes restricted to what we call *furniture*)(dresses or jewels, as in Dem. 27. 10. Etymologically it may be connected with δι-πλό-ς, *tri-plex* and our *three-fold*: see Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.* III p. 50 E. tr. The fullest discussion of the word is in Pollux 10. 10 f.

9

ἐπισίγματα

9 Hesych. II p. 170 ἐπιστήγματα· ἐπιτελέσματα. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι. Salmasius emended to ἐπιστίγματα, and so Hesychius must have written, as the alphabetical order shows; but that ἐπισίγματα was the form used by Sophocles is proved not merely by Moeris p. 196, 34 ἐπισίξας Ἀττικοί· ἐπιστίξας Ἕλληνες, but also by the evidence of early texts. Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 704 κἀθ' ὅταν οὗτός γ' ἐπισίξῃ, with the schol. Ἀκλώφρων καὶ οἱ περὶ Ἐρατοσθένην τὸ ἐπαφιέναι τοῖς κύσιν ἐπισίζειν. Theocr. 6. 29 σίξα δ' ὀλαστεῖν νιν καὶ τᾷ κυνί. Suid. ἐπισίξει· ποιόν τινα ἦχον ἐπιβοήσει. *Etym. M.* p. 363, 54 ἐπίσιστον· τὸ συρίζοντας ἐποτρύνειν τοὺς κύνας ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα ἐν τοῖς κυνηγεσίοις ἐπίσιστον καλεῖται. In *Phil.* 755 Bergk conjectured τοὐπίσιγμα for τοἰπίσαγμα. It is suggested that this refers to the death of Learchus, hunted as a stag by his father Athamas: Apollod. 3. 28 Ἀθάμας μὲν τὸν πρεσβύτερον παῖδα Λέαρχον ὡς ἔλαφον θηρεύσας ἀπέκτεινεν. See Introductory Note. It should be added that Hesych. II p. 167 has also ἐπίσιγμα· ἐπεγείλεωμα κυσίν, and ἐπισίξαι· ἐπαφεῖς ἐπὶ ὀρμήν. ἢ ἐπιστίξαι.

10

ἐχρωματίσθη

10 Hesych. II p. 248 ἐχρωματίσθη· συνεχωρήθη. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθάμαντι. Cf. Suid. *s.v.* ἐχρωματίσθη· χρῶμα ἐδέξατο. Tr. fr. adesp. 278 χρωματισθεὶς εὐθὺς ἐξ εὐνῆς φόνῳ.

ΑΙΑΣ ΛΟΚΡΟΣ

Ajax, *Οἰλῆος ταχὺς υἱός*, is introduced in Hom. B 527 as leader of the Locrians who dwelt opposite to the coast of Euboea. He is often mentioned in the *Iliad* in conjunction with the Telamonian Ajax; and, though inferior in strength as compared with his namesake, is nevertheless a distinguished warrior who comes especially into prominence at the battle round the wall (N 46). The circumstances of his death are related in δ 499 ff. He was one of the victims of the storm which overtook the Greeks on their return from Troy, and, when landing on the rocks at Myconus known as the Gyrae, was hurled back into the sea by Poseidon and drowned, in punishment for a boastful speech that he needed no divine aid to escape. Homer says that he was *ἐχθόμενος Ἀθήνῃ*, without explaining the reason; but, if we accept the explanation of Strabo (600), this merely implies that he was involved in the common fate which befel the Greeks for abusing their victory in the sack of Troy. Homer, he says, has not mentioned any outrage committed against Cassandra, and knows nothing of her violation by Ajax. Yet, even in Homer, the character of Ajax showed traces of a cruel and savage disposition, and his arrogant contempt for the gods led to his destruction. It is clear, however, that an act of sacrilegious violence committed by him was described in the *Iliupersis*[1]: see Proclus *chrestom.* (*EGF* p. 49) *Κασσάνδραν δὲ Αἴας Ὀιλέως πρὸς βίαν ἀποσπῶν συνεφέλκεται τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ξόανον· ἐφ' ᾧ παροξυνθέντες οἱ Ἕλληνες κατολεῦσαι βούλονται τὸν Αἴαντα. ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς βωμὸν καταφεύγει, καὶ διασώζεται ἐκ τοῦ ἐπικειμένου κινδύνου.* To the latter part of this corresponds Apollod. *epit.* 5. 25 *ὡς δὲ ἔμελλον ἀποπλεῖν πορθήσαντες Τροίαν, ὑπὸ Κάλχαντος κατείχοντο, μηνίειν Ἀθηνᾶν αὐτοῖς λέγοντος διὰ τὴν Αἴαντος ἀσέβειαν. καὶ τὸν μὲν Αἴαντα κτείνειν ἔμελλον, φεύγοντα δὲ ἐπὶ βωμὸν εἴασαν.* Cf. schol. Hom. γ 135. Welcker (p. 162) rightly observed that the Homeric story does not seem capable of dramatic treatment; but in the extracts just quoted the possibility of a tragic conflict is manifest. It can hardly be doubted that we have here part of the frame-

[1] On the question relating to the overlapping of the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliupersis* and as to whether there were or were not two poems with the latter title, composed by Arctinus and Lesches respectively, see Frazer, *Pausanias*, v p. 362; T. W. Allen in *Cl. Q.* 11 84.

work of the Sophoclean plot, more especially as the account of Apollodorus explains Eur. *Tro.* 69—71: ΑΘ. *οὐκ οἶσθ' ὑβρισθεῖσάν με καὶ ναοὺς ἐμούς;* | ΠΟ. *οἶδ' ἡνίκ' Αἴας εἶλκε Κασάνδραν βίᾳ.* | ΑΘ. *κοὐδέν γ' Ἀχαιῶν ἔπαθεν οὐδ' ἤκουσ' ὕπο.* Further details are given by Pausanias in his description of the painting by Polygnotus in the Lesche at Delphi (10. 26. 3): 'Ajax the son of Oileus stands by the altar with his shield, taking an oath concerning the outrage on Cassandra; while Cassandra is seated on the ground clasping the image of Athena, as it seems that she overturned it from its pedestal, when Ajax dragged her from the sanctuary.' Robert (*Die Iliupersis*, p. 63) thinks that Ajax was swearing to atone for his crime by sending two Locrian maidens annually to the temple of Athena at Troy. He thus connects the oath with the temple-story (Toepffer in Pauly-Wissowa 1 938) which sought to explain the historical custom by reference to a heroic legend. The chief authorities for the Locrian tribute, which lasted until shortly before the time of Plutarch, are Timaeus ap. Tzetz. Lycophr. 1141 (*FHG* 1 207), and Callimachus ap. schol. AD Hom. N 66 (II 126 Schneider). See also Holzinger on Lycophr. 1153. But Robert's explanation of the oath taken by Ajax is somewhat far-fetched, and it is simpler to suppose that there is a reference to the exculpatory oath which is prescribed as a mode of trial by primitive systems of jurisprudence: see Wyse on Isae. 12. 9. In any case, the trial of Ajax before the council of elders provided an occasion for a formal debate (*λόγων ἀγών*) such as the tragedians loved. It is sometimes stated (as by Toepffer *u.s.*) that the erotic motive and the violation of the priestess did not belong to the original story, but were the invention of later writers (*e.g.* Dio Chrys. 11. 153). The conclusion is questionable; and it is worth notice that Apollod. *epit.* 5. 22 *Αἴας δὲ ὁ Λοκρὸς Κασάνδραν ὁρῶν περιπεπλεγμένην τῷ ξοάνῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς βιάζεται· διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ξοάνον εἰς οὐρανὸν βλέπειν*, which is believed to derive from epic sources, agrees exactly in its account of the miraculous aversion of the gaze of the image with Lycophr. 361 f. (cf. Strabo 264). The early appearance of the motive is also attested by Theogn. 1223 f. *ὤλετο δ' Αἰγείδης Θησεὺς μέγας, ὤλετο δ' Αἴας* | *ἐσθλὸς Ὀιλιάδης σῇσιν (sc. Ἔρωτος) ἀτασθαλίαις*, as well as by the evidence of early vase-paintings collected by Furtwängler and Reichhold, *Griech. Vasenmal.* München 1904, 1 p. 185, and summarized by Gruppe in *Bursians Jahresb.* CXXXVII 387.

The effect of the above discussion is to determine the outlines of the story as known to Sophocles: we are still as far as ever from being able to fill in the details, or to trace the

process by which the tragic *περιπέτεια* resulted. No doubt the outrage in the temple was outside the action of the play, and the two chief moments that fell within the time covered by it were the acquittal of Ajax by the Achaeans, and his subsequent death at Gyrae. It was impossible for the latter to be enacted on the stage, and it must either have been related by a messenger or foretold by a god. The former alternative is clearly to be preferred, but involves the assumption that Ajax sailed before the rest of the Greeks, and that his death was reported at Ilion before the other characters in the play had started. It is more difficult to conjecture how the acquittal of Ajax was procured. A possible suggestion, based on the lawless character of the accused and the oath mentioned by Pausanias, would be that he escaped death by a brazen act of perjury, but was required as being ceremonially unclean to withdraw from the rest of the army. The retribution of the offended deities was not long in coming; but even so the shadow of impending disaster hung over those who had connived at the crime of Ajax. It may be inferred from Pausan. 10. 31. 2 that the chief opponent of Ajax was Odysseus.

The version of the story adopted by Philostr. *heroic.* 9 presents certain features which suggest a dramatic origin, although we have no means of identifying it.

According to this, Ajax dragged Cassandra from the temple, but offered no violence to her, and kept her in his tent. Agamemnon saw the girl, fell in love with her, and took her from Ajax. When the spoils were divided, Ajax claimed her, but Agamemnon refused to give her up and accused Ajax of sacrilege. In order to excite odium against Ajax, he also caused a rumour to be spread through the camp that Athena was incensed in consequence of the outrage, and would destroy the army unless Ajax were put to death. But Ajax, fearing injustice and oppression, if he submitted himself to trial, secretly withdrew by night in a small boat and was drowned off Gyrae.

From Lucian *de salt.* 46 *καθ' ἕκαστον γοῦν τῶν ἐκεῖ* (*i.e.* at Troy) *πεσόντων δρᾶμα τῇ σκηνῇ πρόκειται...ἡ κατὰ Παλαμήδους ἐπιβουλὴ καὶ ἡ Ναυπλίου ὀργὴ καὶ ἡ Αἴαντος μανία καὶ ἡ θατέρου ἐν ταῖς πέτραις ἀπώλεια*, Nauck is justified in inferring an allusion to the present play. Hygin. *fab.* 116 cannot be used in support of Hartung's view that the story of Nauplius was combined with that of the Locrian Ajax in a single tragedy.

11

καταστίκτου κυνὸς
σπολὰς Λίβυσσα, παρδαληφόρον δέρος

11. 2 σπολα σαιβύσσα R

11 Schol. Ar. *Av.* 933 πρὸς τὴν σπολάδα, ὅτι διφθέρα ὁποιαοῦν. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι Λοκρῷ 'καταστίκτου...δέρος.' Καλλίστρατας δὲ οἷον ἔφαπτον δερμάτινον. Εὐφρόνιος δὲ χιτῶνα δερμάτινον. παρήχθη δὲ ἴσως ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιφέρεσθαι, οὐκ ἐξὸν ἐνεζῶσθαι διφθέραν. τὸ δὲ Σοφόκλειον ἐπὶ τοῦ δέρματος εἴρηται τοῦ κρεμαμένου πρὸς τῇ τοῦ Ἀντήνορος οἰκίᾳ. This note appears in an abridged form in Suid. *s.v.* σπολάς, and v. 2 is quoted by Pollux 7. 70 without the name of the play.

2 σπολάς may be conveniently rendered 'jerkin.' Pollux (*l.c.*) speaks of it as a leathern cuirass, fastened at the shoulders, and Photius (*lex.* p. 531, 17) as δερμάτιον ἐφαπτῶδες, suitable for use in war. It is sometimes described as χιτών, as by Euphronius and Hesych.; but the distinction (παρήχθη), according to the schol.'s suggestion, lay in the mode of attachment, since a leather coat could not be strapped with a girdle.—**παρδαληφόρον δέρος**. L. and S. give παρδαλήφορον and are followed by Campbell, who renders 'the hide the leopard wore,' as if it could be assumed at will. So also Blaydes, who however suspects that we should read παρδαλῆς στικτὸν δέρος and eject καταστίκτου κυνὸς as a gloss. But this is contrary to all analogy, and there is no more difficulty in the transference of the epithet than *e.g.* in κερασφόρους στόρθυγγας fr. 89, ξιφηφόρους ἀγῶνας Aesch. *Cho.* 582 or κισσοφόροις ἐν θαλίαις Eur. *Bacch.* 384. Much confusion in the treatment of compounds would be avoided, if critics would pay more attention to the simple and logical methods of the Sanskrit grammarians: see Peile, *Notes on Tale of Nala* p. 3 ff., Brugmann *Comp. Gr.* II p. 92 E. tr.

The reference is to the leopard-skin hung outside the house of Antenor, in order that it might be identified and spared when the Greeks entered Troy: see Strab. 608, a passage to be quoted in connexion with the *Antenoridae*. Hartung thinks that our fragment actually came from the last-named play and is wrongly attributed to the *Locrian Ajax*, but the incident might well have been mentioned in a play which was so closely concerned with the circumstances of the sack of the city,—perhaps, as Wagner suggests, in the speech of Cassandra accusing Ajax.

12

τὸ χρύσεον δὲ τᾶς Δίκας δέδορκεν
ὄμμα, τὸν δ' ἄδικον ἀμείβεται.

12. 1 τὰς δίκας Stob. et Ath. codd.

12 Stob. *ecl.* 1. 3. 37 p. 59, 2 W. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι. 'τὸ χρύσεον ἀμείβεται.' The passage is also cited inexactly by Athen. 546 B καί ποὺ τις καὶ ποιητὴς ἐφθέγξατο (Eur. fr. 486) 'δικαιοσύνας τὸ χρύσεον προσωπον' καὶ πάλιν 'τὸ χρύσεον ὄμμα τὸ τᾶς Δίκας,' where the writer appears wrongly to assert that the two quotations are from the same poet.

'The eye of Justice' became proverbial: see Polyb. 23. 10. 3 κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἔστι δίκης ὀφθαλμός, ἧς μηδέποτε δεῖ καταφρονεῖν ἀνθρώπους ὑπάρχοντας (Suid. *s.v.* δίκης ὀφθαλμός). Tr. fr. adesp. 421 ἔστιν Δίκης ὀφθαλμός, ὃς τὰ πάνθ' ὁρᾷ (sometimes attributed to Diphilus or Philemon). Dionys. fr. 5 ὁ τῆς Δίκης ὀφθαλμὸς ὡς δι' ἡσύχου | λεύσσων προσωπου πάνθ' ὁμῶς ἀεὶ βλέπει. *A. P.* 7. 357 κἂν με κατακρύψῃς ὡς οὐδενὸς ἀνδρὸς ὁρῶντος, | ὄμμα Δίκης καθορᾷ πάντα τὰ γιγνόμενα. Cercidas fr. 1 col. ii 12 μήποτ' οὖν ὁ τᾶς Δίκας ὀφθαλμὸς ἀπεσπαλάκωται; In Eur. *Suppl.*

564 *τὸ τῆς Δίκης σῴζων φάος* is doubtful. Occasionally it is varied to the eye 'of Zeus' or 'of the gods': Tr. fr. adesp. 485 *οὐχ εὖδει Διὸς | ὀφθαλμός, ἐγγὺς δ' ἐστὶ καίπερ ὢν πρόσω*, 491 *ὀξὺς θεῶν ὀφθαλμὸς εἰς τὰ πάντ' ἰδεῖν*, 499 *μέγα γὰρ ὄμμα δαιμόνων, οἳς τίνουσ' ἀμοιβὰς κακῶν*. Zeus is all-seeing: *O. C.* 704, *Ant.* 184, *El.* 175, 659. Tr. fr. adesp. 43, 278. Cf. Eur. fr. 555 *ἀλλ' ἡ δίκη γὰρ καὶ διὰ σκότου βλέπει*. The addition of *χρύσεον*, still more boldly applied by Eur. fr. 486, suggests a comparison like that of Pind. *Ol.* 1. 1 to the searching rays of the sun (*Ant.* 103, Aesch. *Ag.* 300, Eur. fr. 771): cf. *ὁ πάντα λεύσσων ἥλιος O. C.* 869. Similarly Tr. fr. adesp. 500 *Δίκας δ' ἐξέλαμψε θεῖον φάος*.

The metre cannot be determined exactly, but it seems probable that two iambic trimeters are comprised in the words quoted. In that case the second line is defective, and I would suggest that we should read *<ἐξ>αμείβεται*, a word suspected without any cause in Aesch. *Prom.* 239 *κακαῖσι ποιναῖς ταῖσδέ μ' ἐξημείψατο*. The trimeter would then be parallel to *O. T.* 653. Headlam (*J.P.* XXXI 8) preferred to arrange and read thus: *τὸ χρύσεον δὲ τᾶς Δίκας | δέδορκεν ὄμμα, τὸν ἄδικον δ' ἀμείβεται*.

2 Blaydes conjectured *τόν τ'*.

13

ἄνθρωπός ἐστι πνεῦμα καὶ σκιὰ μόνον.

13 Stob. *flor.* 98. 48 (IV p. 840, 14 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι (sic MA, Αἴαντι om. S) '*ἄνθρωπός...μόνον*.' The line is referred to this play, as not being extant in the *Ajax*; but it is not unlikely, as Dindorf and van Leeuwen suggested, that the ascription Αἴαντι is an error. The latter thought that Αἴαντι was due to a slip of memory on the part of the anthologist, who had in mind *Ai.* 125, and that the true source of the quotation cannot be ascertained (*de Ai. Soph. authentia*, p. 119).

The epigram marks by two images the emptiness and unreality of human life: 'Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher.' In *Eccl.* 1. 14 the R.V. has 'all is vanity and a striving after wind' (*προαίρεσις πνεύματος* LXX). But **πνεῦμα** is rarely used in this connexion, mere breath without any substance: cf. Phoenix Coloph. ap. Athen. 530 F *ἐγὼ Νίνος πάλαι ποτ' ἐγενόμην πνεῦμα, | νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔτ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ γῆ πεποίημαι*. More familiar is *ἄνεμος* of things variable: Suid. *s.v. ἀνέμου παιδίον*, Eupolis fr. 376 (I 358 K.) *ἄνεμος καὶ ὄλεθρος ἄνθρωπος*.—**σκιά**, of things unsubstantial, is common: fr. 945. Eur. fr. 509 *τί δ' ἄλλο; φωνὴ καὶ σκιὰ γέρων ἀνήρ*. *Ai.* 125 *ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν | εἴδωλ', ὅσονπερ ζῶμεν, ἢ κούφην σκιάν*. Eur. *Med.* 1224 *τὰ θνητὰ δ' οὐ νῦν πρῶτον ἡγοῦμαι σκιάν*. Or the notion is emphasised by some addition: fr. 659, 6 (n.) *εἴδωλον σκιᾶς*, *Ant.* 1170 *καπνοῦ σκιά*. Pind. *Pyth.* 8. 95 *ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὔτις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος*.

For *ἐστι* Burney conjectured *ἴσθι*.

14

σοφοὶ τύραννοι τῶν σοφῶν ξυνουσίᾳ.

14 The verse is assigned to Sophocles by Libanius *epist.* 33. A fuller tradition gives the name of the play and discusses Plato's error: Zenob. 5. 98 (Miller, *Mélanges*, p. 363; Crusius, *Anal.* p. 153) *τοῦτο Σοφοκλέους ἐστὶν ἐξ Αἴαντος τοῦ Λοκροῦ. Πλάτων δέ φησιν Εὐριπίδου εἶναι τὸ ἰαμβεῖον. καὶ οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν· συμπίπτουσι γὰρ ἀλλήλοις οἱ ποιηταί*. This is almost identical with schol. Plat. *rep.* 568 A. The schol. on Ar. *Thesm.* 21 adds that Aristophanes in the *Ἥρωες* (fr. 308 I 471 K.) distinctly attributed the line to Euripides, and that Antisthenes as well as Plato did the same; he is quite at a loss to account for the confusion, but mentions the view of some (*ὥσπερ ὑπονοοῦσί τινες*) that the two poets by a coincidence hit on

the same line. See also Aristid. II p. 373 Dind., who treats Plato's view as an error, and Aul. Gell. 13. 19. 1, who adds to the confusion by substituting the *Theaetetus* for the *Theages* as the dialogue containing the misquotation. On the other hand, Plato's attribution to Euripides is accepted by Stob. *flor.* 48. 5 (IV p. 251, 10 Hense), and hesitatingly by Themist. p. 72 C **Εὐριπίδης ἤ ὅστις δή ποτέ ἐστιν ὁ ποιήσας.** Several late authorities, references to which will be found in Nauck, cite the line without giving the name of any author.

The circumstances detailed above raise a curious literary question, viz. why Plato (in *Theag.* 125 B and *rep.* 568 A) assigned a line to Euripides which was in fact written by Sophocles. We may leave out of account the possibility of coincidence, although Didymus is thought to have been responsible for this suggestion in criticising Aristophanes of Byzantium, who gave this v. as an instance of **κλοπή** (Nauck, *Arist. Byz.* p. 280). It is possible but not very likely that one poet was quoting from the other; so that an error, rendered still more remarkable from the fact that it was common also to Aristophanes and Antisthenes, is the only supposition remaining which will account for the facts. Adam (on *rep.* 568 A), while pointing out that such an error was more likely to take place in ancient times than it would be now, thinks that the cant use of **σοφός** in Euripides made it all the easier.

The point of the line is that kings profit by the discourse of the wise men who flock to their courts. The typical instance is that of Simonides, who sojourned successively at the courts of Hippias, Scopas, and Hiero. Aristotle relates the anecdote that Simonides, questioned by Hiero's wife whether it is better to be wise or rich, replied in favour of the latter, on the ground that he was accustomed to see wise men spending their time at the gates of the rich (*rhet.* 2. 16. 1391ᵃ 8 ff.). Poets are often called **σοφοί** in respect of their technical skill, but Simonides had considerable reputation as a moralist, and in this capacity he appears as giving advice to Hiero in Xenophon's dialogue of that name: cf. [Plat.] *epist.* 2 **περὶ Ἱέρωνος ὅταν διαλέγωνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ Παυσανίου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου, χαίρουσι τὴν Σιμωνίδου ξυνουσίαν παραφέροντες ἅ τε ἔπραξε καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς.** Cf. generally *Rhes.* 206 **σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρὸς χρὴ σοφόν τι μανθάνειν.**

15

τί σοι ὁ Ἀπόλλων κεκιθάρικεν;

15 τίσιν Macar. | ἐκιθάρισεν Plut.

15 Zenob. 6. 14 (Miller, *Mélanges*, p. 370): **'τί σοι ὁ Ἀπόλλων κεκιθάρικεν;' τὸ 'κεκιθάρικεν' οἷον ἐμαντεύσατο· ὥς φησιν Αἰσχύλος ἐν Αἴαντι Λοκρῷ.** Suid. *s.v.*: **'τί σοι ὁ Ἀπόλλων κεκιθάρικεν;' ἀντὶ τοῦ τί σοι ἐμαντεύσατο.** To the same effect Plut. *prov.* 1. 7, and Macar. 8. 37. Dindorf recognized that Αἰσχύλος was a mistake for Σοφοκλῆς, as the former did not write a play entitled Αἴας Λοκρός. Nauck suggested that the quotation should begin **τί σοι δ' Ἀπόλλων**, which is at least more metrical. It is generally considered that **κεκιθάρικεν** is corrupt on the ground that oracles at Delphi were delivered by the voice of the Pythia, which is identified with that of the god: H., who thinks that either the reading or the explanation must be wrong, refers to Ar. *Plut.* 39 **τί δῆτα Φοῖβος ἔλαχεν ἐκ τῶν στεμμάτων;** Hence Meineke (*Theocr.*² p. 463) conjectured **τί δῆτ' Ἀπόλλων σοι τεθρίακεν** (cf. fr. 466), and Nauck, following him, **ἐντεθρίακεν** (coll. Hesych. II p. 108), which Dindorf approved. Cobet (*Coll. Crit.* p. 187), who says 'nihil horum est Sophocle dignum οὐδ' ἐγγύς,' actually proposes to read **τί δῆθ' ὁ Φοῖβος ἔλαχεν;** I do not share these doubts. The harp and the bow are mentioned together with the prophetic function as the chief prerogatives of Apollo in Hom. *h. Ap.* 131 **εἴη μοι κίθαρίς τε φίλη καὶ καμπύλα τόξα, | χρήσω δ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν**, where Gemoll quotes Callim. *h. Ap.* 44 **Φοίβῳ γὰρ καὶ τόξον ἐπιτρέπεται καὶ ἀοιδή, | κεἶνον δὲ Θριαὶ καὶ μάντιες.** His oracles were **ἔμμετρα** and **μέλη**, and as such properly accompanied by the **κίθαρις**, and referred to the god of music and song: see Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1283. This connexion is explicitly acknowledged by Plutarch:

Pyth. or. 5 p. 396 C *καίτοι μουσηγέτης ὁ θεός, καὶ τῆς λεγομένης λογιότητος οὐχ ἧττον αὐτῷ καλὸν ἢ τῆς περὶ μέλη καὶ ᾠδὰς εὐφωνίας μετεῖναι. ib.* 6 p. 397 A *τάχα δὴ μεμψόμεθα τὴν Πυθίαν, ὅτι Γλαύκης οὐ φθέγγεται τῆς κιθαρῳδοῦ λιγυρώτερον.* If the Pythia was *κιθαρῳδός*, it is not surprising that Apollo, who was represented in art both as *κιθαριστής* and *κιθαρῳδός*, should be said *κιθαρίζειν* in his mantic capacity. The citharoede is the interpreter of the citharist, as the *προφήτης* interprets the *μάντις*. Cf. Pind. fr. 150 (of the muse of the poet) *μαντεύεο Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ.*—Blaydes conjectured *τί νυν Ἀπόλλων σοι κεκιθάρικεν νέον;*

16

καὶ πεζὰ καὶ φορμικτά

16 Schol. Eur. *Alc.* 446 *οὐρείαν χέλυν*] *...τουτέστι μετὰ λύρας. καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Αἴαντι Λοκρῷ 'καὶ πεζὰ καὶ φορμικτά.'* This is usually regarded as the only extant example of the word *πεζός* being applied to rhythmical verse unaccompanied by music. But the same use actually occurs in Plat. *soph.* 237 A *ἀρχόμενος δὲ καὶ διὰ τέλους τοῦτο ἀπεμαρτύρατο* (Παρμενίδης) *πεζῇ τε ὧδε ἑκάστοτε λέγων καὶ μετὰ μέτρων· οὐ γὰρ μήποτε τοῦτο δαμῇ, φησίν, κτέ.* (fr. 7 D), where the commentators unnecessarily suppose that oral teaching is referred to. Nor is there any reason why we should interpret otherwise Com. fr. adesp. 601 III 516 K. *παῦσαι μελῳδοῦσ', ἀλλὰ πεζῇ μοι φράσον*, or the gloss of Phot. *lex.* p. 405, 17 *πεζῷ· γόῳ· ἄνευ αὐλοῦ ἢ λύρας.* The meaning here is perfectly clear, though Campbell seems inclined to think that the word may have its common later sense of prose; for the passage of Sophocles was quoted to illustrate the text of Euripides which proceeds *μέλψουσι καθ' ἑπτάτονόν τ' ὀρείαν | χέλυν, ἕν τ' ἀλύροις κλέοντες ὕμνοις*, and the critics are no doubt right in referring the later words to the rhapsodists. Thus *πεζά* (*ἔπη*) is the same as Plato's *ψιλὴ ποίησις* (*Phaedr.* 278 C), or *μαθήματα ἄλυρα ποιητῶν κείμενα ἐν γράμμασι, τοῖς μὲν μετὰ μέτρων* (*legg.* 810 B), and Aristotle's *ψιλομετρία* (*poet.* 2 1448[a] 10). The schol. adds a pertinent illustration (see also Phot. *lex. s.vv.* *πεζὰς μόσχους* and *πεζῇ*, and *Etym. M.* p. 658, 36), according to which the adjective was jestingly applied to *hetaerae*: *καὶ πεζαὶ δέ τινες ἑταῖραι λέγονται, αἱ χωρὶς ὀργάνου εἰς τὰ συμπόσια φοιτῶσιν.*

Blaydes suggests *φορμιγκτά*, comparing *σαλπιγκτής*: but Meisterhans[3] p. 84 shows that inscriptions always have *σαλπικτής*.

17

Ἑλλάς

17 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 97, 4 Ἑλλάς· *ὁ ἀνήρ. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι Λοκρῷ.* H. shows that this is an error of the *Antiatticist*, in which he does not stand alone. Ἑλλάς is a fem. adjective similar to *πεδιάς, ὀργάς, Τρῳάς, Ἀσιάς, Φθιάς, Ἀττική*, and so forth; and it is difficult to believe without definite proof that it was used for Ἕλλην. The cause of the misunderstanding appears to have been that *οὔθ' Ἑλλὰς οὔτε βάρβαρος* or *τίς Ἑλλὰς ἢ βάρβαρος*, with or without *γῆ*, were phrases commonly employed: Dem. 9. 27 *οὔθ' ἡ Ἑλλὰς οὔθ' ἡ βάρβαρος τὴν πλεονεξίαν χωρεῖ.* Max. Tyr. 6. 3 *εἴ που καὶ γένοιτο τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἢ τῆς βαρβάρου γῆς.* The transition to the idea of a person is found in *Trach.* 1060 *οὔθ' Ἑλλὰς οὔτ' ἄγλωσσος οὔθ' ὅσην ἐγὼ | γαῖαν καθαίρων ἱκόμην ἔδρασέ πω, | γυνὴ δέ...*, where *ἄγλωσσος* is a synonym for *βάρβαρος* (Pind. *Isth.* 6. 24 *οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος οὔτε παλίγγλωσσος πόλις*). Here it is evident that what is to be understood with Ἑλλάς is *γαῖα*, but since the meaning is *no inhabitant* of such a land, the transition to a person is easy. So in Eur. *Phoen.* 1509 *τίς Ἑλλὰς ἢ βάρβαρος ἢ τῶν προπάροιθ' εὐγενετᾶν ἕτερος ἔτλα...*; although we pass to *ἕτερος*, we shall hardly doubt that *τίς Ἑλλὰς*='what Hellene land?' Yet there the scholiasts vary: one rightly says *τίς Ἑλληνικὴ γῆ*, another has *τίς Ἑλληνικὴ ἢ βάρβαρος, δηλονότι γυνή*, another *ἤγουν τίς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ Ἕλλην ἢ βάρβαρος*, yet another, *γρ. τίς Ἕλλην.*

18

δατούμενος

18 Schol. Aeschin. 2. 121 p. 65. 7 Dind. *διεξαλλε δὲ κἀκεῖνον διαιρούμενος τὸν λόγον*] *οἱονεὶ σαφῶς λέγων καὶ ἀντικρυς κατὰ διαίρεσιν καὶ φανερῶς· ἢ ὑπομερίζων καὶ διαβάλλων* (διαλαμβάνων conj. Nauck) *ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι φασκων 'δατούμενος'· τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ δύναται.*

Schneidewin (*Coni. Crit.* p. 102) concluded that the scholiast had made a mistake, and that the passage which he really had in his mind was *Trach.* 791 *τὸ δισπάρευνον λέκτρον ἐνδατούμενος | σοῦ τῆς τελαινης.* Dindorf was of the same opinion; but their inference is too hasty. There is no reason why Sophocles should not have used *δατούμενος* in the same sense as *ἐνδατούμενος*; and we have no sufficient ground for suspecting the scholiast of a double error. The metaphor in *ἐνδατεῖσθαι* is clearly explained by the schol. on *Trach. l.c. σφοδρῶς λοιδορούμενος· ἐνδατεῖσθαι γὰρ σφοδρῶς ἐσθίειν. λοιδορῶν, μεμφόμενος, κατὰ μέρος τῶν λεγομένων ἀνακαλῶν· ἐνδατεῖσθαι γὰρ τὸ μερισασθαι, ἡ δὲ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν δαινυμένων.* To the same effect but more briefly Hesych. 11 p. 89 *ἐνδατεῖται· ἀπομερίζει* (l. *ὑπομερίζει*)....*ἐνδατούμενος· μερίζομενος καὶ οἱονεὶ κακῶς λέγων σφοδρῶς. ἀπὸ τῆς δαιτὸς.* [These extracts show clearly that Nauck was wrong in conjecturing *διαλαμβάνων* in schol. Aeschin. The annotators there doubted whether *διαιρούμενος* meant 'accurately defining' or 'dividing up and so censuring,' and quoted *δατούμενος* in Soph. in support of the latter view. The words of the scholiast, as printed in Dindorf's *Poet. Scenici*, are unintelligible, owing to a strange dislocation of their order. There is no variation in the MSS, except that cod. F does not contain the second part of the note.] Lycophr. 155 *τὸν ὠλενίτην χόνδρον ἐνδατούμενη*, 'chewing the shoulder muscles,' testifies to the literal meaning. Hence, through the ideas of repetition and insistence, is developed the metaphorical sense of 'to dwell upon,' as applied to abstract ideas or to speech: see Verrall and Tucker on Aesch. *Ther.* 565. The notion of blame is not essential to the figurative meaning of *ἐνδατεῖσθαι*, and the same was probably true of the simple verb, although the evidence is defective. The Latin phrases *differre* or *dispergere dictis*, like our 'to pick to pieces,' arose in a different way: cf. *διασύρω*. Observe also that the English 'to mince' acquired the sense of 'to depreciate (a matter)' by yet another course of development.

ΑΙΓΕΥΣ

Casaubon on Athen. 122 F seems to have thought that the early adventure of Aegeus at Troezen related in Plut. *Thes* 3 was the subject-matter of Sophocles' play. But, as Welcker (p. 394) remarks, the material is only sufficient for the beginning of a tragedy. Of the six fragments which are cited from the play four clearly refer to the journey made by Theseus to Athens for the purpose of discovering his father, and the dangers which he encountered before his identity was established. This fact leaves little doubt as to the period covered by the story, and makes it probable that the *ἀναγνώρισις* of Theseus formed the climax of the action rather than the death of Aegeus after the return from Crete. It is thus impossible to agree with Wernicke (in Pauly-Wissowa 1 954) that the contents of this

play are entirely unknown; and it rather appears that Ahrens was right in supposing that the plot was similar to that of the Euripidean *Aegeus*, which culminated in the recognition of Theseus and the discomfiture of Medea (Plut. *Thes.* 12). But the new fragment (fr. 25) relating to the capture of the Marathonian bull is of peculiar importance, as showing that in Sophocles this adventure preceded the recognition, instead of occurring at a later period according to the account of Plutarch (*Thes.* 14). In the *Hecale* of Callimachus it happened in the lifetime of Aegeus, but was subsequent (it would seem) to the recognition: see *Cl. Rev.* VII 429 Θησεὺς οὐχ ἑκὰς υἱὸς ἀπ' εὐύδρου Μαραθῶνος | ζωὸν ἄγων τὸν ταῦρον, and cf. Diod. 4. 59, where Aegeus receives and sacrifices the bull. But in Apollod. *epit.* 1. 5 Medea warns Aegeus to beware of Theseus, who is accordingly sent against the bull; on the victorious return of Theseus, the attempted poisoning and the recognition follow. Ov. *Met.* 7. 434 gives the same order of events. Thus, Apollodorus confirms the statement of *Myth. Vat.* 1. 48 that Theseus was sent against the bull at the direct instigation of Medea, and we may conjecture that Sophocles adopted this version. The disappearance of Medea's agency in other accounts is attributed by Gruppe (p. 580_2) to the influence of Euripides, who did not include the Marathonian adventure[1]. The considerations which have been mentioned justify us in restoring fr. 24 to the *Aegeus*, from which Nauck in his second edition separated it; and it is probable that fr. 905 also belongs here.

19

Ταύρειον πῶμα

19 πόμα cod.: corr. Nauck

19 Athen. 122 F τὸ δὲ Ταύρειον ὕδωρ ὠνόμασεν...Σοφοκλῆς Αἰγεῖ (ἐν γαι cod., corrected to ἐν Αἰγεῖ by Casaubon, to Αἰγεῖ by Schweighäuser) ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ Τροιζῆνα ποταμοῦ Ταύρου, παρ' ᾧ καὶ κρήνη τις Τόεσσα καλεῖται. To the same effect but without the name of the play Eustath. *Il.* p. 881, 22, who copied the epitome of Athenaeus. With the help of Athenaeus Casaubon corrected the corrupt gloss of Hesych. IV p. 133 Ταύρειον πόμα· ἀπὸ αἰγειταύρου ποταμοῦ Σοφοκλῆς Τροιζῆνα πάρα καὶ κτήνη Τόεσσα to Σοφοκλῆς Αἰγεῖ ἀπὸ Ταύρου ποταμοῦ <περὶ> Τροιζῆνα, παρ' ᾧ καὶ κρήνη Τόεσσα.

From these facts it has rightly been inferred that the lemma of Hesych. represents the text of Sophocles, but πῶμα (Nauck) should be restored in place of the later substitute πόμα: see Cobet, *N. L.* p. 455, *V. L.* p. 85. M. Schmidt preferred στόμα. It should be added that Athenaeus shortly before (122 A), after quoting Ar. *Eq.* 83 f., adds οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἰπoιμι Ταύρειον ὕδωρ πιεῖν, ὅπερ σὺ οὐκ οἶσθα τί ἐστιν. Brunck strangely inferred that Athen. and Hesych. were really quoting fr. 178, which he accordingly supposed to have belonged to the *Aegeus*, substituting πῶμα Ταύρειον for αἷμα ταύρειον.

Pausanias (2. 32. 7) mentions that the

[1] R. Wagner's theory (*Epit. Vat.* p. 125) that Euripides was the first to connect it with Medea is altogether improbable.

source of the river Hyllicus, which was originally known by the name Taurius, was to be found on the mountain path leading to Hermione, and that in the same neighbourhood was the rock called after Theseus, because he found beneath it the sandals and sword of Aegeus. This is enough to show that an allusion to the river Taurus is appropriate to the subject of Sophocles' play. For the situation of the Hyllicus see Frazer's *Pausanias*, III p. 279.

20

κέστρᾳ σιδηρᾷ πλευρὰ καὶ κατὰ ῥάχιν παίων ἀπηλόησε

20. **2** *παίων ἀπηλόησε* scripsi: *ἠλοῆσαι πλεῖον* codd., *ἤλαυνε παίων* Casaubon, *ἐν ἠλόησα* M. Schmidt, *ἤθλησε* (vel *ἤθλησα*) *παίων* Nauck, *ἤλκωσε παίων* Herwerden, *ἠλόησα* (vel -*ε*) *λεῖον* Mekler

20 Pollux 10. 160 *καὶ κέστρα δὲ σφύρας τι εἶδος σιδηρᾶς, ὡς ἐν Αἰγεῖ Σοφοκλῆς 'κέστρᾳ.. πλεῖον.'* Hesych. II p. 470 *κεστρίαι σιδηραῖ* no doubt refer to v. 1, but the explanation has fallen out. Just before he has *κέστρα· ἀμυντήριον ὅπλον. σφῦρα.* Hartung interpreted these words as referring to Periphetes, called also Corynetes, whom Theseus overthrew in the first of his contests not far from Epidaurus. This view might be supported from Apollod. 3. 217, where his weapon is described as *κορύνην σιδηρᾶν*; but two of the recently discovered authorities establish beyond doubt that the allusion is to Procrustes (or Procoptes), who fitted his victims to the bed provided for them either by cutting off the extremities of those who were too big, or by hammering out the bodies of those who were too small. The duplicated name corresponds to the double function. His weapon, at any rate for the beating-out process, was a hammer: see Bacchyl. 17. 27 *Πολυπήμονός τε καρτεραν σφύραν ἐξέβαλεν Προκόπτας.* Apollod. *epit.* 1. 4 *τοὺς μὲν βραχεῖς ... σφύραις ἔτυπτεν.* Similarly Hygin. *fab.* 28 *incudibus suppositis extendebat.* Schol. Eur. *Hipp.* 977, confusing Sinis and Procrustes, says of the former: *μετὰ σφύρας ἀπέκοπτε τοὺς πόδας.*

1 **κατὰ** must be taken *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* with *πλευρὰ* as well as with *ῥάχιν*. Cf. Alcman fr. 22 *φοίναις δὲ καὶ ἐν θιασοισιν*, Pind. *Nem.* 10. 38 *χαρίτεσσί τε καὶ σὺν Τυνδαρίδαις*, Eur. *Helid.* 756, *Phoen.* 284, Soph. *O. T.* 734, fr. 314. 367.

2 The reading is very uncertain (see cr. n.); but *πλεῖον* is in any case untenable, and Casaubon's *παίων* has a high degree of probability. On the other hand, *ἠλόησε* (-*ῆσαι* codd.) is too good to be due to accident, and the metre may be restored by an alteration in the order of the words, and the introduction of the Homeric compound *ἀπηλο(ί)ησεν*, which is used (Δ 522) of the crushing of a man's leg by a rock hurled at him. Mekler's conj. assumes that the lines are trochaic with – – – missing at the beginning of the first; but that metre does not seem suitable to a descriptive passage.

21

κλύω μὲν οὐκ ἔγωγε, χωρίτην δ' ὁρῶ

21 *κλύω μὲν* Meineke: *ἐκλύωμεν* cod. R, *ἐκλύομεν* vulg. | *δ'* Meineke: *γ'* cod. R, *σ'* vulg.

21 Steph. Byz. *s. v.* *χώρα* p. 699. 11 *χωρίτης, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἕδρα ἑδρίτης, ἑσπέρα ἑσπερίτης. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰγεῖ 'ἐκλύωμεν .. ὁρῶ.'*

I have followed Meineke, but without any confidence; for the absence of a context makes restoration peculiarly difficult here. Brunck read *ἐκλύομεν*. *οὐκ ἔγωγε χωρίτην σ' ὁρῶ*, and Hartung accepts this, supposing that Theseus is thus greeted on

his arrival. But the emphasis so thrown on *ἔγωγε* seems unnatural. Blaydes prefers *χωρίτης δ' ὁρᾷ* (or *ὁρῶ*). The meaning of the text may be 'I do not learn by hearsay, but see with my own eyes that you are a native,' with the same contrast as in *Trach.* 747, *Phil.* 681 and elsewhere; or 'though I don't hear your voice, I can see' etc., in which case we might compare *O. C.* 139, 1642, *Phil.* 1412. Meineke, however, thought that in reply to a remark by his interlocutor that he heard the sound of shouting, the speaker said that he himself had heard nothing, but now saw a native approaching.—**χωρίτην**, *a fellow-countryman*: cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 1035. For the word see on fr. 92.

22

πῶς δηθ' ὁδουρὸν οἷος ἐξέβης λαθών;

22 *ὁδουρὸν οἷος* Valckenaer: *ὁδουρῶν* (*ὁδουρὸν* CP) *ὅμοιος* codd., *ὁδουρῶν σμῆνος* Nauck

22 Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 57 *πειρατὰς τοὺς κατὰ πέλαγος λῄστας λέγομεν, κυρίως δὲ τοὺς ἐν ὁδῷ κακουργοῦντας· παρ' ὃ δὴ καὶ ὁδουροὺς αὐτοὺς λέγουσιν. Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἀρχελάῳ* (fr. 260) *'ἔπαυσ' ὁδούρους λυμεῶνας.' καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Αἰγεῖ 'πῶς...λαθών;'*

This may be taken to refer to Sciron, who infested the Scironian cliffs in the neighbourhood of Megara; and *ἐξέβης* (*ὦδ' ἔβης* conj. Blaydes) would then express the successful crossing of the 'Evil Staircase' (Eur. *Heclid.* 860 n.). Otherwise, Nauck's *ὁδουρῶν σμῆνος*, 'nest of robbers,' is an attractive conjecture, and *ὁδοῦ* or the like might have been the noun to be supplied with *ἐξέβης*. Less probable conjectures are *ὁδουρῶν ὅμματ'* (Wakefield), *ὁδουρῶν οἶμον* (Kock), *ὁδουρὸν ὅμορος* (R. Ellis), *ὁδουρῶν ὅμαδον* (Mekler).—**ὁδουρόν**, *highwayman*. Later synonyms were *ὁδοιδόκος* and *ὁδοστάτης*, but *ὁδουρός* soon became obsolete: cf. *οὖρος*, *ἐπίουρος*, *φρουρός*.

23

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν φύλλοισιν αἰγείρου μακρᾶς,
κἂν ἄλλο μηδέν, ἀλλὰ τοὐκείνης κάρα
κινῆσαν αὔρας κἀνακουφίζει πτερόν

23. **1** *ἐν φύλλοισιν* M: *εὐφύλλοισιν* V **2** *τῆς κείνης* M **3** *κινῆσαν αὔρας* scripsi: *κινήσῃς αὔραις* codd. | *κἀνακουφίζει* Brunck: *ἀνακουφίζει* codd.

23 Schol. *Od.* η 106 *τὰ φύλλα τῆς αἰγείρου...εὐκίνητα ῥᾳδίως καὶ ὑπὸ ⟨τῆς⟩ τυχούσης* (the addition of *τῆς* is Nauck's correction) *αὔρας, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Αἰγεῖ* (so Heath for *ἐναργῶς* or *ἐν Ἄργει* of the MSS) *'ὥσπερ...πτερόν.'*

1 ff. The last line is certainly corrupt (see cr. n.), and has not hitherto been satisfactorily emended. The following points should be observed: (1) it appears to be certain that **ἄλλο μηδέν** and **κάρα** are both accusatives, so that the subject is to be looked for in v. 3. At any rate, the order of the words shows that *τοὐκείνης κάρα* bears the main emphasis, and is co-ordinated and contrasted with *ἄλλο μηδέν*: see n. on fr. 940 *εἰ σῶμα δοῦλον, ἀλλ' ὁ νοῦς ἐλεύθερος*, and Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 357 ff. (2) With **κἄν** must be supplied *κινήσῃ* or whatever may be the verb in v. 3: cf. Ar. *Ach.* 1021 *μέτρησον εἰρήνης τί μοι, κἂν πέντ' ἔτη.* (3) The words **ἐν φύλλοισιν** have a certain awkwardness; and clearly they do not qualify the clause *κἂν ἄλλο μηδέν*. Thus the general sense would be 'even if the breeze is so light as to stir nothing else, it sways the poplar's head *amidst its foliage*,'—in summer as well as in winter. But it is difficult to see how *ἐν φύλλοισιν* can be made to cohere with *πτερόν*, if the latter is interpreted *leafage* (L. and S.).

Hence conjectures like F. W. Schmidt's *ὡς τὸν θυέλλαισιν γάρ*, and several of Blaydes. (4) That *κάρα* is the object of *ἀνακουφίζει* is suggested, if not required, by *O. T.* 23 (*πόλις*) *σαλεύει κἀνακουφίσαι κάρα | βυθῶν ἔτ' οὐχ οἷα τε φοινίου σάλου*. Thus the lines express more than the schol. states, the quivering of poplar leaves in the breeze (Ov. *Am.* 1. 7. 54 *ut cum populeas ventilat aura comas*, *Her.* 14. 40); but their truth to nature, as interpreted above, is within everyone's observation. Dindorf's elegant conjecture *κινεῖ τις αὔρα* (with *κἀνακουφίζει*, which seems inevitable) is accepted by Nauck, but it does not get over the difficulty of *πτερόν*. The same remark applies to Tucker's ingenious supplement to Dindorf's correction, *τοὐν κείνης κἀμοῦ* for *τοὐκείνης κάρα*. Blaydes, making *κάρα* subject, proposed *κινηθὲν αὔραις ὡς πτερὸν κουφίζεται* (or *τὴν κόμην ἀναπτεροῖ*), as well as several other alternatives. Herwerden reads *κλίνει τις αὔρα κἀνακουφίζει πεσόν*, where *κλίνει*, although otherwise attractive, is less suited than *κινεῖ* to supply a verb to *κἂν ἄλλο μηδέν*. See also Babr. 36. 12 *κἂν βαιὸν ἡμῶν ἄνεμοι ἄκρα κινήσῃ*. F. W. Schmidt altered *πτερόν* to *ῥέπον*, Gomperz to *πάλιν*. But I do not think that *πτερόν* is likely to be corrupt, and prefer to suppose that it refers to the 'wings of the wind' (see *Psalms* 18. 10, 104. 3), reading *κινῆσαν αὔρας*, and making *αὔρας πτερόν* the subject to *ἀνακουφίσει*, which is merely emphasized by *καί* (*Trach.* 490, *Phil.* 380). The metaphor is none too bold for Sophocles; wind-gods such as Boreas were regularly represented in fifth century art as winged. In Latin literature there are many parallels: cf. *e.g.* Ov. *Met.* 1. 264 *madidis Notus evolat alis*, and see *Thesaurus* i 1465, 50. It is possible that this was M. Schmidt's view, who in *Philol.* XVIII 229 f. proposed to read *πτερῷ* for *πτερόν*, but he gives no explanation of his conjecture. Wecklein's *κινῇ τις αὔρα, πάντα κουφίζει πτερόν* (*i.e.* 'omnia tolluntur') is condemned by the awkwardness of *πτερόν*. H., who thought that the subj. *κινήσῃ* was due to *κἂν* in the previous line, suggested *κίνησις αἴρει*; but we cannot do without *αὔρα*.

24

ὥρισεν πατὴρ
ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀκτὰς τῆσδε γῆς <ἀποικίσαι,>
πρεσβεῖα νείμας· <εἶτ>α..... Λύκῳ

24. **1** *πατὴρ ὥρισεν* Strab. **2** *ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀ...ν εἰς ἀκτὰς τῆσδε γῆς* Strab. | *ἀποικίσαι* add. H. **3** *εἶτα* supplevit Meineke

24 Strabo 392 *οἵ τε δὴ τὴν Ἀτθίδα συγγράψαντες, πολλὰ διαφωνοῦντες, τοῦτό γε ὁμολογοῦσιν, εἴ γε λόγου ἄξιοι, ὅτι τῶν Πανδιονιδῶν τεττάρων ὄντων, Αἰγέως τε καὶ Λύκου καὶ Πάλλαντος καὶ τετάρτου Νίσου, καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς εἰς τέτταρα μέρη διαιρεθείσης, ὁ Νίσος τὴν Μεγαρίδα λάχοι καὶ κτίσαι τὴν Νίσαιαν. Φιλόχορος (*FHG* I 388) μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ Ἰσθμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ Πιττίου διορισεν αὐτοῦ φησι τὴν ἀρχήν· Ἄνδρων (*FHG* II 351) δὲ μέχρι Ἐλευσῖνος καὶ τοῦ Θριασίου πεδίου. τὴν δ' εἰς τέτταρα διανομήν, ἄλλων ἄλλως εἰρηκότων, ἀρκεῖ ταῦτα παρὰ Σοφοκλέους λαβεῖν· φησι δ' ὁ Αἰγεύς δτι 'ὁ πατὴρ ὥρισεν ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀ . . ν εἰς ἄκρας τῆσδε γῆς πρεσβεῖα νείμας . . . . .α Λύκῳ τὸν ἀντίπλειρον . . . . Πάλλας.'*

This fragment was formerly assigned to the *Aegeus* with general consent; but Nauck, who in his 1st edition followed the common opinion, subsequently changed his mind, and without giving any reason spoke of the ascription as 'improbable.' I cannot see to what play the words are appropriate, if not to the *Aegeus*, especially now that our data have been enlarged in regard to the scope of the play: see Introductory Note. The reference to Pallas points in the same direction, as may be seen from Plut. *Thes.* 13.

There is not very much direct evidence, apart from this passage of Strabo, touching the fourfold division of Attica between the sons of Pandion. The most explicit statement to be found elsewhere is in schol. Ar. *Lys.* 58 *διήρητο γὰρ εἰς δ' μέρη τὸ παλαιὸν ἡ Ἀττική. Πανδίων γὰρ διαδεξάμενος τὴν Κέκροπος βασιλείαν, προσαγαγόμενος δὲ καὶ τὴν Μεγαρίδα, ἔνειμε τὴν χώραν τοῖς παισὶν εἰς δ' μοίρας· Αἰγεῖ μὲν*

τὸν ἀντίπλευρον κῆπον Εὐβοίας νέμει·
Νίσῳ δὲ τὴν ὅμαυλον ἐξαιρεῖ χθόνα
Σκίρωνος ἀκτῆς· τῆς δὲ γῆς τὸ πρὸς νότον
ὁ σκληρὸς οὗτος καὶ γίγαντας ἐκτρέφων
εἵληχε Πάλλας.

4 *νέμει* Coraes: *νέμων* vulgo, litteris *μων* in cod. A. m. sec. suppletis **5** *ὅμανδον* et *ὅμαλον* al. **6** *Σκείρωνος* Strab.

τὴν παρὰ (l. *περὶ*) *τὸ ἄστυ μέχρι Πυθίου, Πάλλαντι δὲ τὴν παραλίαν, Λύκῳ δὲ τὴν Διακρίαν, Νίσῳ δὲ τὴν Μεγαρίδα.* The allusion to the Pythion in the Daphne pass, where a monastery afterwards stood, indicates that Philochorus is the ultimate source of the scholiast. Briefer but to the same effect, though without the words *μέχρι Πυθίου*, is schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 1223. The schol. on Eur. *Hipp.* 35, who derives other parts of his note from Philochorus, has a garbled account, omitting Lycus, and giving no explanation of the divided rule. A somewhat different version appears in Apollod. 3. 206, which agrees with Pausan. 1. 5, 4. 39, 4. According to this, the four sons divided the country between themselves after the death of Pandion, when they had returned to Athens and expelled the Metionidae: Apollodorus illustrates Soph. by concluding with the words *εἶχε δὲ τὸ πᾶν κράτος Αἰγεύς.*

'Aegeus speaks: *πατὴρ* is Pandion. 1. Aegeus obtained the capital, Athens, with the Athenian plains, and the coast of those plains which was specially called *Ἀκτή* (*Dict. Geo.* 1 p. 322: cp. Strabo 9 p. 391), the *ἄστυ*, the *πεδιάς*, and the *ἀκτή*. 2. Lycus got the *Διακρία*, the highland district in the N.E. of Attica, between Parnes, Pentelicus and the sea. 3. Nisus got Megaris, where he founded Nisaea the sea port. 4. Pallas got *τὸ πρὸς νότον—i.e.* the southern coasts, from Sunium to Cape Brauron on one side (the E.) and to C. Zoster on the other—the *παραλία*.

This legendary division must have had a basis of fact. After the Megarid had been reft from Attica, the three other divisions are found corresponding with political parties in the sixth century B.C. —the *Πεδιεῖς*, the *Πάραλοι*, and the *Διάκριοι* (Hdt. 1. 59: Plut. *Solon* 13, *Dict. Geo.* 11 p. 324).' (J.)

1 ff. These lines cannot be restored with any certainty, more particularly as the tradition of Strabo is mutilated: see cr. nn. (1) Meineke (followed by Nauck) gave: *ἐμοὶ μὲν ὥρισεν πατὴρ | ἀκτὰς ἀπελθεῖν τῇσδε γῆς... | πρεσβεῖα νείμας· εἶτα... Λύκῳ.* He would fill up the gaps with *προσεσπέρους* and *δευτέρῳ*. (2) Casaubon conj. and Brunck edited: *πατὴρ δ' ἀπελθεῖν ὧριο' εἰς ἀκτὴν ἐμοί, | πρεσβεῖα νείμας τῇσδε γῆς· τῷ δ' αὖ Λύκῳ*—but the comb nation *ἐμοὶ μέν* ought to be kept. (3) J. suggests either *ἐμοὶ μὲν ἄρχειν* (or *ἀρχὴν*) *ὧριο' εἰς ἀκτὰς πατὴρ* or *ἐμοὶ μὲν ὥρισεν πατὴρ | ἀκτὰς ἀνάσσειν τῇσδε γῆς κεκτημένῳ*. (4) Blaydes conjectured *τυραννεῖν* or *ἐνοικεῖν* for *ἀπελθεῖν* and wished to introduce *παρακτίας*.—Lycus was subsequently driven out by Aegeus (Pausan. 1. 19. 3).

4 ἀντίπλευρον, *opposite*, c. gen. Strabo speaks of Attica as a triangle with three *πλευραί* (or *πλευρά*); the second which is *μηνοειδὴς* extends as far as Oropus in Boeotia,—*τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ δεύτερον πλευρὸν ἐῷον τῆς Ἀττικῆς* (p. 391).—**κῆπον**, 'domain,' as in fr. 956, 3.

5 ὅμαυλος is similarly applied to persons in a satyr-play of uncertain authorship (*Ox. Pap.* 1083, fr. 1. 8): see also Hesych. III p. 201 has *ὅμαυλον· ὁμόκοιτον, ὁμοῦ αὐλιζόμενον*, and cf. fr. 717, Aesch. *Cho.* 597 *ξυζύγους δ' ὁμαυλίας.*—**ἐξαιρεῖ**: the act. is used of the donor, and the middle of the recipient. See Jebb on *Trach.* 245. Hdt. 4. 161 *τῷ βασιλέι Βάττῳ τεμένεα ἐξελών.*

6 Σκίρωνος ἀκτῆς. The genitive is governed by *ὅμαυλον* as=*γείτονα*. For the Scironian rocks see on fr. 905. The route extending for about six miles along the cliffs between Megara and the Eleusinian plain, and known in modern times as the 'Evil Staircase,' is described in Frazer's *Pausanias*, II p. 546 f.—For the form *Σκίρων* (not *Σκείρων*) cf. Callim. fr. 378. That the form with *ι* is the older is attested by inscriptions on stone (*CIG* 7723) and vases (Gruppe, p. 599$_6$).—**τὸ πρὸς νότον.** Blaydes should not have jectured *νότου*, for the accusative is well established: see Kuehner-Gerth I 515.

7 f. The fifty sons of Pallas had

already plotted against Aegeus before the appearance of Theseus, wishing to secure for themselves the succession to the throne (Plut. *Thes.* 3). Subsequently, Pallas and his sons revolted against Theseus (Pausan. 1. 22. 2), but were destroyed by him (Apollod. *epit.* 1. 11, Plut. *Thes.* 13. Pausan. 1. 28. 10, Eur. *Hipp.* 35).—The description of Pallas's sons as giants is very remarkable, and the reason is not plain. We may note, however, the following coincidences which link the legend of the battle between the giants and the gods with the defeat of the Pallantidae (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 438). (1) Athena was called Pallas because she slew a giant of that name: Suid. *s.v.* Πάλλας, *Etym. M.* p. 649. 54; cf. Apollod. 1. 37. (2) As the Chalcidic Pallene was the scene of the giants' defeat, so Theseus destroyed the Pallantidae at the Attic Pallene (Plut. *l.c.*). (3) Two of Pallas's sons were named Clytus and Butes (Ov. *Met.* 7. 500), two of the giants Clytius and Botes. It is further to be observed that Tzetzes *theog.* Matranga II 580 calls Aegeus and Hippolytus giants. It may be, however, that the Pallantidae are called *γίγαντες* in virtue of their insolent opposition to authority; in the case of Capaneus (Aesch. *Theb.* 411, quoted by J.) the significance of the name is obvious.

25

κλωστῆρσι χειρῶν ὀργάσας κατήνυσε σειραῖα δεσμά.

25 Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 64, 8 *ἀκοῦσαι ὀργῶ· καθόλου δὲ ποικίλως χρῶνται τῷ ὀνόματι· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ βρέξαι, ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος, Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ παίοντα ἐξελαύνειν καὶ μαλάττειν τίθησι, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Αἰγεῖ · φησι - τὸν Θησέα στρέφοντα καὶ μαλάττοντα τοὺς Μίνως ποιῆσαι δεσμὰ τῷ ταύρῳ. Μίνει δὲ οὕτως· 'κλωστῆρσι...δεσμά.'*

The extract clearly relates to the adventure of the Marathonian bull, and shows that it formed a part of the plot of the *Aegeus*: see Introductory Note. Theseus did not kill the bull on the spot, but captured it and drove it back to the city, where it was subsequently sacrificed to Athena or Apollo: cf. Plut. *Thes.* 14 *χειρωσάμενος ἐπεδείξατο ζῶντα διὰ τοῦ ἄστεως ἐλάσας, εἶτα τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δελφινίῳ κατέθυσεν.* Pausan. 1. 27. 9 *τὸν δὲ ἐν τῷ Μαραθῶνι ταῦρον ὕστερον Θησεὺς ἐς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐλάσας καὶ θύσας λέγεται τῇ θεῷ.* The words of Sophocles describe the preparation of the cords by which the bull was led. **κλωστῆρσι χειρῶν** is *hand-made twistings* (of withies). Cf. Pollux 7. 31 *κλωστήρ· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν περιστροφὴν τοῦ Μίνου Εὐριπίδης ὠνόμασεν* (fr. 1001), *Μίνου κλωστῆρα περιφέρει λαβών.* Eur. *Tro.* 537 *κλωστοῦ δ' ἁμφιβόλεις Μίνωος, of the ropes used to pull the Trojan horse into the city. For* **ὀργάσας** cf. frs. 482, 787 and for **σειραῖα** Eur. *Her.* 1011 *σὺν τῷ γέροντι δεσμὰ σειραίων βρόχων | ἀνήπτομεν πρὸς κίονα.*

Reitzenstein thinks that the extract is made from a somewhat lengthy discussion of *ὀργάζω*, and assigns it to Phrynichus on the strength of Bekk. *anecd.* p. 7. 3 and p. 53. 31.

ΑΙΓΙΣΘΟΣ

The evidence connecting Sophocles with a play bearing this title is so doubtful that it is idle to speculate as to its contents. Livius Andronicus wrote an *Aegisthus*, which apparently was based on the Homeric version of Agamemnon's murder; and Accius an *Aegisthus* as well as a *Clytaemestra*: Ribbeck, *TRF*[3] pp. 1, 161. See also Introductory Note to the *Iphigenia*.

26

ἡλιωπὸς οὐρανός

26 Philodem. *de piet.* p. 22 G. <Αἰσχύλος> δ' ἐν 'Ηλιά<σιν τὸν> Δία καὶ αἰθέ<ρα λέγει κ>αὶ γῆν καὶ <οὐρανὸ>ν καὶ τὰ πάν<τα καὶ ὑ>πὲρ τὰ πάν<τ'· Εὐριπί>δης δ' ἐν Μυ<σοῖς καὶ>τὸν Δία καὶ <οὐρανὸ>ν ἡλιωπόν, <Σοφοκλῆς> δ' Αἰγίσθῳ <οὐρανὸν μ>όνον, ἐν Οἰ<νεῖ δὲ καὶ τ>ὸν Δία.

Such is the restoration of Gomperz as given in his edition; and it is evident that the latter part of the extract is very doubtful, and that both the name of Sophocles and what he said rest upon an uncertain conjecture. Wilamowitz (*Anal. Eur.* p. 161) also reads <Σοφοκ>[λ]ῆς δ' ἐν Μυσοῖς above. This is the more vexing, as there is no extant passage of Sophocles with a pantheistic import so clearly marked as the fragment of Aeschylus (fr. 70), or Eur. fr. 877 ἀλλ' *αἰθὴρ τίκτει σε, κόρα,* | *Ζεὺς δς ἀνθρώποις ὀνομάζεται*, fr. 941 *ὁρᾷς τὸν ὑψοῦ τόνδ' ἄπειρον αἰθέρα* | *...τοῦτον νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ θεόν*: cf. frs. 839, 911. The lines of Aeschylus are preserved by Clement of Alexandria: *Ζεύς ἐστιν αἰθήρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' οὐρανός,* | *Ζεύς τοι τὰ πάντα χὤτι τῶνδ' ὑπέρτερον*; and the evidence of Philodemus has effectually silenced the doubts of those who thought that Clement was handing down a false tradition. It has now been shown that the pantheism of Aeschylus is due to Orphic influences, and that such a doctrine flourished in Orphic circles in the sixth century or even earlier: see Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, I p. 97 E. tr. Perhaps then the hinted identification of *ἡλιωπὸς οὐρανός* and *ἡλιωπὸς Ζεύς* is less remarkable in Sophocles than it appears at first sight.

For the connexion of Helios with Zeus see on fr. 752.—*ἡλιωπός* does not occur elsewhere, but belongs to a class of adjectives (*κοιλωπός, εὐρωπός, νυκτερωπός* etc.) which is common in tragedy. In many cases the second member of the compound had so weakened that it became a mere suffix, as has been shown by Sturtevant in *Class. Phil.* VII 428 ff. In *ἡλιωπός*, however, the meaning 'appearance' can still be recognized (*ibid.* p. 422).

27

ἀρρύθμων

27 Hesych. I p. 293 *ἀρύθμων· ἀσυμφώνων.* Σοφοκλῆς Αἰγίσθῳ (so Musurus corrected the MS, which gives *αἰγίθῳ*: Dindorf conjectured Αἰγεῖ or Αἰθίοψι, Bergk Αἰθωνι).

ἄρρυθμος may be either *without rhythm* as in Arist. *rhet.* 3. 8. 1408^{b} 24, where it is contrasted with *ἔμμετρος having the rhythm of verse*, and is said to be unlimited (*ἀπέραντον*); or else *having bad rhythm, discordant*, as when it is contrasted with *τὸ εὔρυθμον* (Plat. *rep.* 400 E). It was employed in the latter sense by Sophocles, and so metaphorically of Aphrodite (Eur. *Hipp.* 529 *μήτ' ἄρρυθμος ἔλθοις*).

ΑΙΘΙΟΠΕΣ

Heyne conjectured that this title should be identified with the *Memnon* which is mentioned with other Trojan plays in the Argument to the *Ajax* (p. 3 J.). He is followed by Welcker (p. 136), and is probably right, although anything in the nature of proof is of course impossible. The outline of the plot may

in that case be gathered from Proclus *chrestom.* (Αἰθιοπίς, *EGF* p. 33) Μέμνων δὲ ὁ Ἠοῦς υἱὸς ἔχων ἡφαιστότευκτον πανοπλίαν παραγίνεται τοῖς Τρωσὶ βοηθήσων· καὶ Θέτις τῷ παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει. καὶ συμβολῆς γενομένης Ἀντίλοχος ὑπὸ Μέμνονος ἀναιρεῖται, ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμνονα κτείνει· καὶ τούτῳ μὲν Ἠὼς παρὰ Διὸς αἰτησαμένη ἀθανασίαν δίδωσι. Aeschylus also wrote a play entitled *Memnon* (*TGF* p. 41), and made the death of Memnon the subject of his Ψυχοστασία.

Wagner thought that Strabo 728 made a slip in quoting Aeschylus (fr. 405) as his authority for the statement that Memnon's mother was a Cissian woman, and that it ought to have been attributed to Sophocles.

28

τοιαῦτά τοί σοι πρὸς χάριν τε κοὐ βίᾳ
λέγω· σὺ δ' αὐτὸς ὥσπερ οἱ σοφοὶ τὰ μὲν
δίκαι' ἐπαίνει, τοῦ δὲ κερδαίνειν ἔχου.

28 Athen. 122 C εὕροι τις ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ἢ καὶ σοφιστῶν ἓν ἢ δύο γοῦν πονηρῶς εἰρημένα, οἷα παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ τὸ ἐν Αἰθίοψιν εἰρημένον 'τοιαῦτα...ἔχου.' V. 2 f. σὺ δ' αὐτὸς ...ἔχου are also quoted by Eustath. *Il.* p. 752, 31, who drew from the epitome of Athenaeus.

1 τοι is attached to the pronoun with determinative force: see Jebb on *Ai.* 776 f., Kuehner-Gerth, § 506. 6.—**πρὸς χάριν** κτέ., 'to persuade and not to compel.' Cf. *O.T.* 1152 σὺ πρὸς χάριν μὲν οὐκ ἐρεῖς, κλαίων δ' ἐρεῖς, where it is the person to be addressed who hints at the use of force. *Phil.* 593 διώμοτοι πλέουσιν ἢ μὴν ἢ λόγῳ | πείσαντες ἄξειν, ἢ πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος. Eur. *Supp.* 385 Θησεύς σ' ἀπαιτεῖ πρὸς χάριν θάψαι νεκρούς. Dem. 8. 1 ἔδει τοὺς λέγοντας ἅπαντας μήτε πρὸς ἔχθραν ποιεῖσθαι λόγον μηδένα μήτε πρὸς χάριν. For the emphatic tautology cf. *O.C.* 635 βίᾳ τε κοὐχ ἑκών. Eur. *Hel.* 885 οὐ μὴν ἑκόντα γ' αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς βίαν | ἔζευξ' ἀνάγκῃ. In Eur. *I. A.* 360 ἑκών, οὐ βίᾳ the purpose is not merely rhetorical, but to anticipate an objection, as μὴ τοῦτο λέξῃς shows. Herwerden (Eur. *Hel.* p. 101) thought that Sophocles must have written πρὸς χάριν τε κοὐ βίαν as 'longe concinnius.' This is an odd judgment: for such variations are of the essence of Greek style.

2 f. σοφοί. This appears to be a reference to contemporary Sophistic: for its influence on Sophocles see Nestle in *Class. Phil.* v. 154. Athenaeus also refers to *El.* 61, and quotes from Theodorus τὸ κελεύειν μὲν πλέον ἔχειν, ἐπαινεῖν δὲ τὸ ἴσον. Eteocles expresses a similar sentiment in Eur. *Phoen.* 509, where see n. H. quotes Tr. fr. adesp. 4 τοῦ μὲν δικαίου τὴν δόκησιν ἄρνυσο, | τὰ δ' ἔργα τοῦ πᾶν δρῶντος ἔνθα κερδανεῖς, and thinks that our passage may belong to Odysseus, of whom Antisth. *Ai.* 5 makes Ajax say ὁ δὲ κἂν κρεμάμενος εἴ γε κερδαίνειν τι μέλλοι. See also on fr. 354, 4.—For **τὰ μὲν** similarly placed at the end of a line cf. *O.T.* 1237 τὰ μὲν | ἄλγιστ', and for the same licence in the use of the article and καί see Jebb's nn. on *Ant.* 409, *Phil.* 312.—**ἐπαίνει** implies what we express by 'to damn with faint praise': so Hes. *Op.* 643 νῆ' ὀλίγην αἰνεῖν, μεγάλῃ δ' ἐνὶ φορτία θέσθαι. Cf. Juv. 1. 74 *probitas laudatur et alget.* The combination ἀρετὴν ἐπαινεῖν was so familiar that the Stoics made praiseworthiness an inseparable quality of virtue (Stob. *ecl.* II. p. 100, 20, Plut. *Sto. rep.* 13 p. 1039 A, *comm. not.* 6 p. 1061 A), and Chrysippus employed it as an axiom to deduce therefrom the existence of fate (Alex. Aphr. *de fat.* 37 p. 210 Br.).

29

τετράπτεροι γὰρ νῶτον ἐν δεσμώμασιν σφηκοὶ κελαινόρινες

29. **2** κελαιρόρινες Phot., *Etym. M.* cod. D: μελαινόρινες vulgo ap. *Etym. M.* editur

29 Phot. *lex.* p. 22, 15 ἐσφηκωμένον· ἐσφιγμένον, ἀπὸ τῶν σφηκῶν, οἱ κατὰ μέσον ἐσφιγμένοι· ἔνθεν καὶ ὁ σφήν· Σοφοκλῆς Αἰθίοψι τοὺς ἐσφιγμένους μύρμηκας τῇ σαρκώσει· 'τετράπτεροι...κελαινόρινες.' The same words are found in *Etym. M.* p. 385, 3, but without the name of the play. Hesych. IV p. 114 σφηκοί gives the explanation οὐ κεχυμένοι τῇ σαρκώσει, ἀλλὰ συνεσφιγμένοι. Hence Naber, in his edition of Photius, proposed to restore Σοφοκλῆς Αἰθίοψι <σφηκοὺς καλεῖ> τοὺς ἐσφιγμένους μύρμηκας <καὶ οὐ κεχυμένους> τῇ σαρκώσει, and ingeniously conjectured that the words formed part of an allusion to the giant Indian 'ants' described by Herodotus 3. 102—105, as being smaller than dogs but larger than foxes, resembling the Greek ant in form, and pursuing with exceeding swiftness the Indians who come to gather the gold-bearing sand. These animals, he thinks, were mentioned in a description of Mesopotamia, the home of Memnon, to which belonged the epithet ὀρθόπτερος (fr. 33). Nauck, who accepts Naber's view, would prefer to alter καὶ ὁ σφήν in Photius to καλεῖ σφηκούς. Lobeck (*Phryn.* p. 674) took an entirely different view of the meaning; and found a clue to it in the fact that a *cestus* with metal studs was called μύρμηξ. R. Holland in Roscher II 2656 sees in μύρμηκες an allusion to the Myrmidons.

In the absence of the context it is best to connect **ἐν δεσμώμασιν** with **σφηκοί**, 'pinched with strapping': cf. Nonn. *Dion.* I. 192 δέσμιον Ἀνδρομέδην ἑτέρῳ σφηκώσατο δεσμῷ. Poll. 2. 25 οὐκ ἐσφηκωμένην, οὐκ ἔνδετον. *A.P.* 16. 195 καὶ τὰς ὠκυβόλους περιηγέας ἐσφήκωσε | χεῖρας, ὑπὸ στιβαρῷ κίονι δησάμενος; σφηκός appears to be an adjective with the sense of σφηκώδης: Ar. *Plut.* 561 ἰσχνοὶ καὶ σφηκώδεις καὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἀνιαροί is well illustrated by Heliod. 10. 31, where a wrestler is described as ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σφηκώσας, 'with all his body braced.' Cf. fr. 341. Blaydes suggests σφηκτοί or σφικτοί. The tragic τετράπτερος is parodied in Ar. *Ach.* 1082 Γηρυόνῃ τετραπτίλῳ (see on fr. 1127), which refers to a locust.

For allusions in Soph. to Herodotus see Jebb on *O.C.* 337.

Dindorf restored κελαινόρρινες, but no rule can be laid down for these cases: see *e.g.* Aesch. fr. 300, 2 Νεῖλος ἑπτάρρους. The epigraphic evidence is also fluctuating: Meisterhans[3], p. 95.

30

ἄναρκτον

30 Hesych. I p. 181 ἄναρκτον· ἀνυπότακτον, <οὗ> οὐδεὶς ἤρξε (ἤρξαι cod. ἂν ἄρξειε conj. Blaydes). Σοφοκλῆς Αἰθίοψι. οὗ was added by Musurus.

ἄναρκτον is given by M in Aesch. *Eum.* 529, where most editors substitute ἀνάρχετον (Wieseler) for metrical reasons.

31

ἀνθοβοσκόν

31 Hesych. I p. 203 ἀνθοβοσκόν (cod. ἀνθοβόσκον)· ἀνθοτρόφον (qu. ἀνθότροφον). Σοφοκλῆς Αἰθίοψι. L. and S. render *nourishing, growing flowers*; but, apart from authority, I should have thought that the word must mean *flower-fed*, unless it can be shown that βόσκειν ἄνθη was applied to a gardener. But, as an epithet of the bee, the compound agrees with the normal usage of βόσκω, for which see Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 255, *inf.* fr. 140. It is perhaps superfluous to quote Hom. B 89, Eur. *Hipp.* 77. Ahrens, however, finds a reference to Anthemusia in Mesopotamia, which he supposes to have been the home of Memnon.

32

ἀπιστεῖ

32 Hesych. I p. 242 ἀπιστεῖ· ἀπειθεῖ. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰθίοψι (αἰθιοψ cod.).

ἀπιστεῖν in the sense of *to disobey* is common in Sophocles: see *Ant.* 219, 381, 656 etc. Harpocration quotes Antiphon (fr. 21) as using it, and it occurs in Plato (Stallbaum on *Apol.* 29 C); but is otherwise unknown to Attic prose. For ἄπιστος see on fr. 627. On the other hand πιστεύειν for *to obey* is rare: Jebb on *Trach.* 1228.

33

ὀρθόπτερον

33 Phot. *lex.* p. 346. 19 ὀρθόπτερον· Σοφοκλῆς Αἰθίοψιν· ὀρθοὺς ἔχοντα κολωνούς· τὰ γὰρ εἰς ὕψος ἀνέχοντα πτερὰ ἔλεγον· καὶ τὰ περίστωα. Hesych. III p. 219 explains the word but does not refer to Sophocles as using it: ὀρθόπτερος· μεγάλους κολωνοὺς (μεγαλώ. ους cod.) ἔχουσα· πτερὰ γὰρ τὰ εἰς ὕψος ἀνέχοντα. ἢ μεγάλας ἔχουσα περιστῶους (πσταοὺς cod., περιστύλους Blaydes) οἰκοδομάς.

The corrupt text of Hesych. was formerly restored as μεγάλους ὤμους ἔχουσα, and Ellendt mentions without approving it a proposal to substitute ὤμους for κολωνούς in Phot., thus giving to the adjective a meaning similar to that of εὐρύστερνος. But there can be little doubt that **ὀρθόπτερος** was used by Soph.in reference to a place or building. (1) In the latter case the meaning is easy: ὀ. would be like περίπτερος an epithet of ναός, signifying *flanked with columns*. The word περίπτερος occurs several times in Athen. 205 A—E, and was interpreted by Casaubon with the help of Vitruv. 3. 3. 6, describing *eustyli ratio*. πτερόν is properly applied to the projection of the ceiling of the colonnade which stretches out from the cella on either side and rests upon the pillars; it thus follows the analogy of the name ἀετός, as given to the gable: Guhl and Koner, p. 21. Cf. *Ant.* 285 ἀμφίστομας ναούς, with Jebb's n. (2) But the lexicographers appear to assert that Sophocles gave to ὀρθόπτερον the meaning. 'with lofty hills.' It is impossible to say what justification, if any, they had for making this statement.

ΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΤΙΔΕΣ

Welcker's treatment of this play (pp. 171—176) is fanciful and unconvincing. From fr. 35 as compared with Eur. *Tro.* 1136 he concludes that the death of Astyanax was the central incident of the action. Next he infers that the *Astyanax* of Accius (Ribbeck, *Rom. Trag.* 412 ff.) was copied from Sophocles, because the remaining fragments do not show any point of contact with the *Troades* and no other model suggests itself. Accius also wrote a *Troades*, which Welcker thinks was copied from Aeschylus. All this is uncertain in the extreme, and, even if our play was one of Accius' sources, we know too little of his methods to be justified—in the absence of any corroboration—in using the fragments of the *Astyanax* for the reconstruction of the

Αἰχμαλωτίδες. The title obviously suggests that the plot was similar to that of the *Troades*; but the fragments are unfortunately indecisive, and the only certain fact is the statement in the Argument to the *Ajax* that the play belonged to the Τρωικὴ πραγματεία. There is nothing whatever to support Ahrens's guess that the plot is to be found in Hygin. *fab.* 109, which deals chiefly with the story of Iliona.

On the other hand, A. Schoell and Bergk[1] conjectured that the play was largely concerned with the demand for the restitution of Chryseis as related in the first book of the *Iliad*. This view was mainly based on frs. 40 and 43; but Hartung, who accepted it, unwarrantably assumed that *Chryses* was an alternative title for the same play on the ground that frs. 38 and 730 should be identified.

Brunck strangely thought that the Αἰχμαλωτίδες was a satyr-play. The reason which moved him is no longer applicable, since it is now admitted that the line which Harpocration appears to attribute to Sophocles (fr. 34) is actually a fragment from a comic poet.

More recently O. Rizzo[2] endeavoured to reconstruct the play, with the help of a sepulchral relief discovered near the Porta Salaria at Rome, and of the fragments of Accius. He concludes that Odysseus was the chief character on the Greek side, and that he announced to Andromache the impending execution of Astyanax. The latter was not a child, as in Euripides, but a full-grown youth.

34

στρατοῦ καθαρτὴς κἀπομαγμάτων ἴδρις

34 Harpocr. p. 28, 5 ἀπομάττων... Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσι 'στρατοῦ... ἴδρις' καὶ πάλιν 'δεινότατος ἀπομάκτης τε μεγάλων συμφορῶν.' The second extract in Harpocration was printed by the earlier editors as a fragment of Sophocles, but Nauck is almost certainly right in attributing it to a comic poet. The lexicographer's note is attached to Dem. 18. 259 (part of the famous description of Aeschines) καθαίρων τοὺς τελουμένους καὶ ἀπομάττων τῷ πηλῷ καὶ τοῖς πιτύροις. περιμάττειν and ἀπομάττειν are both technical terms in connexion with ceremonies of lustration and purification. The former, according to the explanation of Wyttenbach (on Plut. *de superst.* 3 p. 166 A), denotes the smearing of the body with the magic substance, and the latter the wiping off, 'sed utrumque promiscue de tota lustratione dicitur.' Hence both words are sometimes coupled with καθαίρειν: cf. *Etym. M.* p. 573. 1. ἀπομάγματα is strictly the *offscourings* (τὰ ἀποκαθάρματα Bekk. *anecd.* p. 431, 31; περιθειώματα Hesych.), and it is unneces-

[1] Alternatively, he argued from schol. Hom. λ 547 that the subject might have been the ὅπλων κρίσις. See Jebb, *Ajax*, p. xvi.

[2] *Ö. Jh.* VIII 824: the article became known to me from Gruppe's summary in *Bursians Jahresb.* CXXXVII 157.

sary to follow Campbell in making it equivalent to 'acts or means of purification.' Cf. Menand. fr. 530 III 152 K. (= *Phasma* 54 p. 205 Körte) **περιμαξάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κύκλῳ, | καὶ περιθεωσάτωσαν.** The description would fit an Epimenides.

Hartung, following Schoell's view that the subject of the play is the same as that of the 1st book of the *Iliad*, thinks that this line is part of an appeal for a prophet who shall be competent to save the army from the plague. Welcker holds that the reference is to Calchas.

35

ἀσπὶς μὲν ἡμὴ λίγδος ὡς πυκνομματεῖ

35 ἡμὴ λίγδος Nauck: ἡμίλιγδος codd., ἡμὶν λίγδος Leopardus | πυκνομματεῖ Bentley: **πυκνώματι AB, πυκνὸν ματεῖ C**

35 Pollux 10. 189 **αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πήλινον, ὃ περιέληφε τὰ πλασθέντα κήρινα, ἃ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς προσφορὰν τήκεται καὶ πολλὰ ἐκείνῳ τρυπήματα ἐναπολείπεται, λίγδος (μίλιγδος codd.) καλεῖται· ὅθεν καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη ἐν Αἰχμαλώτοις 'ἀσπὶς...πυκνώματι.'** To this passage Hesych. 1 p. 434 alludes: **γλίδον χοάναι· εἰς οὓς τύπους κατέρχεται τὸ ἐν τῇ χώνῃ διὰ τῶν κεντημάτων. ἦσαν δὲ πήλινοι.** Σοφοκλῆς. Cf. III p. 38 **λίγδος· τόπος χοάνης, καὶ ἡ θυεία ἐν ᾗ χωνεύουσιν. λιγδοῦ χοάνη· οἱ δὲ τὰ λίκνα τῶν ἀργυρίων.**

The speaker describes his shield as riddled with holes, like a **λίγδος**. No doubt Welcker was right in interpreting this as referring to the holes made by the spears of the enemy and not to eyelet-holes, as L. and S. take it.

λίγδος is traditionally explained by the lexicographers (Pollux, Hesychius) as the clay mould covering the wax models which were subsequently melted and poured out through holes made for the purpose on the upper surface of the **λίγδος**. In this way room was left for the molten metal to be poured in. The process (*en cire perdue*) is described by Blumner *Technologie*, IV p. 286. In Phot. *lex.* p. 213, 6 **λίγδος** is not clearly distinguished from the melting-pot or crucible itself: **χῶνος τρήματα ἔχων συνεχῆ τέσσαρα** (leg. **τῷ δ**) **παραπλήσια, δι' ὧν ὁ χαλκὸς ἠθεῖται.** Both meanings appear in the glosses preserved in Eustath. *Od.* p. 1926. 52 (Ael. Dion. fr. 249 Schw.), the last of which agrees with Photius: **ἴσως δὲ ἐκ τοιούτου τινὸς τρόπου καὶ λίγδος παρὰ Αἰλίῳ Διονυσίῳ ὁ χώνος, περὶ οὗ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ γράφεται καὶ ὅτι λίγδος χωνεία ἁλοιφή. καὶ λίγδος· χωνευτήρια, χοάνα, νομισμάτων διατύπωσις (? -εις). ἐν ἄλλῳ δέ, ὅτι λίγδος χῶνος τρήματα ἔχων συνεχῆ παραπλήσια τῷ δ, δι' ὧν χαλκὸς ἠθεῖται.** And in the epics it is the **χόανον** which is said to be bored with holes: Hes. *Theog.* 862 **κασσίτερος θ' ἡ | τέχνῃ ὑπ' αἰζηῶν ὑπό τ' εὐτρήτου χοάνοιο θαλφθείς**, Apoll. Rhod. 3. 1299 **ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐνὶ τρητοῖσιν ἐΐρρωσι χοάνοισιν | φῦσαι χαλκῆας κτέ.**—With **πυκνομματεῖν** Blaydes compares **εὐομματεῖν**, which occurs in Eur. *Andr.* 765, and **εὐληματαῖν** in Aesch. fr. 106.

36

ὑφηρέθη σου, κάλαμος ὥσπερεὶ λύρας

36 σοι Poll.: σοι schol. V Ar. (σου ed. Ald., σοὶ, *i.e.* σοι ὁ, Dind.) | ὥσπερει Poll., ὡς περι schol. V Ar., **ὥστερ** Ald.

36 Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 131 **κάλαμοι πάλαι ἀντὶ τοῦ κέρατος ὑπετίθετο τῇ λύρᾳ. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ συνηθείας καλαμον καλοῦσι τὸ κέρας, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Αἰχμαλώτοις (Αἰχμαλώτοις V) 'ὑφηρέθη λύρας'** Poll. lux 4. 61 **καὶ δόναξ δέ τινα ὑπολύριον οἱ κωμικοὶ ὠνόμαζον ὡς πάλαι ἀντὶ κερίτων ὑποτιθέμενον ταῖς λύραις· ὅθεν καὶ Σοφοκλῆς εἴρηκεν 'ὑφηρέθη λύρας.'** There is a trace of the same commentary in Hesych. 1 p. 529 **δόνακα ὑπολύριον· πάλαι γὰρ ταῖς λύραις κάλαμοι ἀντὶ κέρατος ὑπετίθεντο** and in *Etym. M.* p. 283, 8. Eustath. *Il.* p. 1164, 26 expressly ascribes it to Aelius Dionysius (fr. 133 Schw.), the Atticist who lived in the time of Hadrian: **Αἴλιος δὲ Διονύσιος εἰπὼν ὡς δόναξ καὶ τὸ ὑπολύριον ἐτάγη· τὸ**

γὰρ παλαιὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ κέρατος ὑπετίθεντο κάλαμον. ἐμφαίνει δὲ τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Βατράχοις, ὑπολύριον εἰπὼν δόνακα. There can be very little doubt that the note with the quotations goes back to the best days of Alexandrian scholarship, and it would also appear that at that time the mention of δόναξ (or κάλαμος) in connexion with the lyre was an obscure matter. The explanation they adopted was that the bridge over which the strings are stretched so as to keep them from adhering to the sounding-board was a reed instead of being made of horn, as in later days. (This is entirely distinct from the common use of κέρατα = πήχεις for which see on fr. 244.) In other words, κάλαμος was to be understood as the equivalent of μαγάδιον (Lucian *dial. deor.* 7. 4 καὶ μαγάδιον ὑποθείς), and the same interpretation was adopted for Ar. *Ran.* 233 προσεπιτέρπεται δ' ὁ φορμικτὰς Ἀπόλλων | ἕνεκα δόνακας, ὃν ὑπολύριον | ἔνυδρον ἐν λίμναις τρέφω. We are not in a position to say whether the Alexandrian view is correct; but it is not altogether satisfactory, inasmuch as it fails to take account of the description of the primitive lyre given in the Homeric hymn to Hermes (4. 47 ff.), in which there is no mention of a bridge and δόνακες καλάμοιο occupy an entirely different position, viz. as fixed in the shell to form a framework over which oxhide was stretched so as to produce a sounding-board. (Allen and Sikes's reference to the passage of Pollux is based on a wrong assumption that κέρατα in his text = πήχεις.) And, in spite of the traditional opinion to the contrary, such may have been the meaning of κάλαμος both in Soph. and in Aristoph. In either case, whether κάλαμος is the bridge or part of the sounding-board, the meaning of our line is clear: 'you are like a lyre which has lost its reed.' Campbell, who reads σοι, renders: 'a reed, as it were, has been abstracted from your lyre,' and thinks that it is appropriate to a chieftain, perhaps Agamemnon, who has had his γέρας taken away. But it seems more likely that the subject to ὑφῃρέθη occurred in the previous line, and I have accordingly placed a comma after σου. The comparison is with that which, seemingly intact, is yet so maimed as to be deprived of all its virtue. Thus of Cassandra, after the loss of her honour, it might have been said: <καὶ τὸ θεσπίζειν σαφῆ> ὑφῃρέθη...λύρας. Herwerden, reading σοι, thought that the words referred to a man 'morbo aut senectute aut vitae denique calamitatibus pristino vigore privato.' He quoted παρεξηυλημένος from Ar. *Ach.* 682 and the well-known *Eq.* 513 (of Cratinus).

37

ἐν παντὶ γάρ τοι σκορπίος φρουρεῖ λίθῳ.

37 Schol. Nic. *Ther.* 18 ὑποκάτω τῶν λίθων οἱ σκορπίοι κρύπτονται, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν (αἰχμαλώτοις A) 'ἐν... λίθῳ.'

This was an old proverb to enforce the warning 'don't trust appearances.' Hence Ar. *Thesm.* 528 τὴν παροιμίαν δ' ἐπαινῶ | τὴν παλαιάν· ὑπὸ λίθῳ γὰρ | παντί που χρὴ | μὴ δάκῃ ῥήτωρ ἀθρεῖν, where the schol. refers to Praxilla (fr. 4) ὑπὸ παντὶ λίθῳ σκορπίον, ὦ ἑταῖρε, φυλάσσεο. It is amplified in the scolion (23 B.[4]) quoted by Athen. 695 D ὑπὸ παντὶ λίθῳ σκορπίος, ὦ ἑταῖρ', ὑποδύεται. | φράζεο μή σε βάλῃ· τῷ δ' ἀφανεῖ πᾶς ἕπεται δόλος. Cf. Aelian *nat. an.* 15. 26 εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο μὴ γένοιτο (*i.e.* if the road for the Great King's journey is not thoroughly examined beforehand), ὁ χῶρος ἄβατός ἐστιν· ὑπὸ παντὶ γὰρ λίθῳ καὶ βώλῳ πάσῃ σκορπίος ἐστί. The lexicographers and paroemiographers apply it ἐπὶ τῶν κακοήθων: see Phot., Hesych., Suid., Zenob. 6. 20, Diogen. 8. 59. Nauck thinks that in Zenobius the words ταύτης μέμνηται Σοφοκλῆς which are attached to the previous proverb (see on fr. 814) should be transposed to follow this. For the similar saying ἕνα λίθον ἅρας πένθ' ὑπῆσαν σκορπίοι see Preller on Polemon fr. 151. It has been well remarked by Weir Smyth (*Greek Melic Poets*, p. 485) that the Greeks did not expect fair dealing from strangers.

Blaydes would read ὑπὸ παντὶ κτέ., as in the authorities quoted, but the objection to ἐν as the equivalent of 'under' does not appear to be well founded. Cf. Hom. Σ 521 ὅθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι, ἐν ποταμῷ. Plat. *legg.* 625 B ἀνάπαυλαι ἐν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς δένδρεσίν εἰσι σκιαραί.

38

καὶ βωμιαῖον ἐσχάρας λαβών...

38 Steph. Byz. p. 191, 8 *βωμοί...καὶ βωμός ὁ τόπος τῶν θυσιῶν, ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἐσχάραν διάφορος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ οἰκοδομητός, ἡ δὲ σκαπτή. τὸ τοπικὸν βώμιος καὶ κατὰ παραγωγὴν βωμιαῖος. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτισι 'καὶ...λαβών.'*

Meineke supplied *λίθον* as the missing word at the end of the line, but Campbell's suggestion of *βάθρον* is perhaps better. He remarks that the words may have applied to a suppliant taking refuge at the altar, and might have quoted Eur. *I. T.* 962 *ἐγὼ μὲν θάτερον λαβὼν βάθρον*,—of Orestes on his trial before the Areopagus. Vater on *Rhes.* 913 proposed *ἐς χέρας λαβὼν θεόν*. *βωμιαῖος* does not appear to occur elsewhere. The distinction made by Stephanus between *βωμός* and *ἐσχάρα* is supported by other ancient authorities such as Phot. *lex* p. 23, 3 *ἐσχάρα· ἡ ἐπὶ γῆς ἑστία στρογγυλοειδής·...ὁ δὲ βωμὸς τὸ ἐν ὕψει ἐστὶ πρὸς θυσίαν οἰκοδόμημα*, and schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 *ἑστία...ὁ ἐπὶ γῆς βόθρος, ἔνθα ἐναγίζουσι τοῖς κάτω ἐρχομένοις*. The usage of both words fluctuates: *ἐσχάρα* is generally the more specific, meaning (1) a sacrificial hearth level with the ground, (2) a movable brazier, (3) a hollow on the upper surface of the altar; but just as *βωμός* is sometimes employed in the two former of these senses, so *ἐσχάρα* takes the place of *βωμός* frequently in verse (cf. fr. 730) and occasionally in prose and inscriptions. Here of course the explanation of Stephanus has no reference to the text of Sophocles, for *ἐσχάρας* appears to be a possessive genitive, and *βωμιαῖον* relates to the structure: 'the raised (pedestal) of the altar.' Similarly in Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (n.) *βώμιοι ἐσχάραι* are 'the structured altars'; but in *Andr.* 1138 *βωμοῦ κενώσας δεξίμηλον ἐσχάραν* the meaning is rather 'the sacrificial slab of the altar (mound),' for it is impossible to say whether the form or the character of *βωμός* is the more prominent. For further information see Reisch in Pauly-Wissowa VI 614 ff.

39

καὶ νησιώτας καὶ μακρὰς Εὐρωπίας

39 Steph. Byz. p. 287, 10 *Εὐρώπη, ἡ χώρα. λέγεται καὶ Εὐρώπεια καὶ διὰ τοῦ ῑ Εὐρωπία παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ Αἰχμαλώτισι 'καὶ Εὐρωπίας.'*

Stephanus quotes also Eur. fr. 381 *σχεδὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς κρασπέδοις Εὐρωπίας*. For *μακρὰς* Brunck conjectured *μακρὰν*, Ellendt *μακρᾶς*, Bergk *κἀκ μακρᾶς*: Campbell, however, remarks that the succeeding words may have been *οἰκοῦντας ἀκτάς* or the like.

40

ταύτην ἐγώ, Κίλλαν τε καὶ Χρύσην...

40 Steph. Byz. p. 697, 1 *Χρύση, βαρυτόνως, ἡ πόλις τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐγγὺς Λήμνου. Σοφοκλῆς Λημνίαις* (fr. 384)...*καὶ ἐν Αἰχμαλώτισι 'ταύτην...Χρύσην.'*

Cilla and Chrysa were both places in the Troad where Apollo had sanctuaries: Hom. A 37 *ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην Τενεδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις*. Their position in the neighbourhood of the gulf of Adramyttium is described by Strabo 612; he also states that the older town of Chrysa was destroyed, and that the new town, to which the temple of Apollo was transferred, was near Hamaxitus on the slope of Mt Lekton. It should be observed that Stephanus has confused this Chrysa (or Chryse) with the small island of the same name in the neighbourhood of Lemnos, for which see on fr. 384.

Meineke, who observes that the codd. of Stephanus indicate a lacuna after *Χρύσην*, plausibly suggested that the words were spoken by Apollo, and that *κίλλαν* should complete the line. It is, however,

extremely awkward to connect *ταύτην* with the place-names; and I think it is more likely that Hartung was right in placing a comma after *ἐγώ*, and in making *ταύτην* refer to one of the captive women. In the latter case a participle such as Hartung's *ἑλών* would follow *Χρύσην*: he takes the speaker to be Achilles.

41

εἰ μικρὸς ὢν τὰ φαῦλα νικήσας ἔχω

41 Phot. *lex.* p. 643, 8 *φαῦλον...τεθείη δ' ἂν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτισιν· εἰ...ἔχω.*' The same words are found as part of what is substantially the same article in *Etym. M.* p. 789, 43 and Suid. *s.v. φαῦλον*. Nauck adds schol. Greg. Naz. in Piccolomini's *Studi di filol. gr.* 1 p. 166 and *lex. Vindob.* p. 187, 8, where the line is quoted without the name of the play.

The statement of the lexicons that *φαῦλον* = *μέγα* is incredible, even when supported by the gloss of Hesych. IV p. 234 giving *ἀδρόν* and *μέγα* among the explanations of *φαῦλον*. But it does not seem possible to account for the error either by supposing (1) with Campbell, that the words are used ironically, or (2) with Ellendt, that the grammarian who made the quotation was so stupid as to take *φαῦλα* for the antithesis to *μικρός*. It is much more likely that the words *ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου* are the result of a corrupt tradition. In favour of this conclusion it should be observed (1) that in *Etym. M.*, though not in Phot. and Suid., the catalogue of meanings and examples is introduced by the words *φαῦλον σημαίνει δέκα*; (2) that the tenfold division is recognized in the abbreviated list without examples given in Bekk. *anecd.* p. 315, 1 *τὸ φαῦλον σημαίνει δέκα, ἐπί τε προσώπου καὶ πράγματος τὸ κακόν, τὸ μικρὸν καὶ τὸ εὐκαταφρόνητον, καὶ τὸ ἀσθενές, καὶ τὸ ἄδοξον, καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον, καὶ τὸ ἁπλοῦν, καὶ τὸ ταπεινόν· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πένητος, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐναντίου τῷ σπουδαίῳ, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐτελοῦς*; (3) that the last-quoted list, which contains ten categories but has nothing corresponding to *μέγα*, agrees generally (though not exactly) with the lists of the three other lexicons, and that all alike go back to a common original Boethus, the author of a Platonic lexicon, according to Naber. From these facts it might be inferred that the *μέγα*-category was not part of the original note, that the Sophoclean example was probably cited under the category named *τὸ ἀσθενές* in Bekk. *anecd.*, and that the words *ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου* are a corruption of *ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐναντίου τῷ μεγάλῳ* or something of the same kind. But, if it seems incredible that the line of Sophocles was ever seriously quoted to prove that *φαῦλον* was a synonym of *μέγα*, some other explanation must be sought for the persistence of the category *μέγα* in Eustath. *Il.* p. 1356, 64 and schol. Plat. *Alcib.* II p. 147 D *τὸ φαῦλον ἐπὶ τεσσάρων ἐννοιῶν τάσσεται, κατ' ἐναντιότητα παραλαμβανομένων. ἐπὶ ἁπλότητος καὶ εὐηθείας Δημοσθένης*· (19. 30, cf. 3. 27) *οὐ γὰρ εἰ φαύλοις ὑμεῖς προστάταις χρῆσθε· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐπαίνου Εὐριπίδης* (fr. 473). *ἐπὶ δὲ μεγέθους, φαῦλον στόμα ἀντὶ τοῦ μέγα. ἐπὶ δὲ μικρότητος κτέ.* Stephanus understood *φαῦλον στόμα* as an *ugly* mouth; but perhaps *φαῦλον* was interpreted *powerful* as being *injurious*: cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 94, *Andr.* 870.

Ellendt well suggests that the words quoted may have been preceded by *μὴ θαυμάζετε*, 'don't be surprised that I who am naught have won a paltry victory.' They are a particular application of proverbial wisdom: cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 107 *σμικρὸς ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις ἔσσομαι*. So in another connexion *τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἕλα.*—**τὰ φαῦλα** is an internal acc. rather than the direct object: cf. Eur. *Alc.* 1029 *τὰ μὲν γὰρ κοῦφα τοῖς νικῶσιν... τοῖσι δ' αὖ τὰ μείζονα νικῶσι*, fr. 1034 *τὸ νικᾶν τἄνδιχ' ὡς καλὸν γέρας, | τὰ μὴ δίκαια δ' ὡς ἁπανταχοῦ κακόν.*—Wecklein (*Sitzgsb. bayr. Ak.* 1890 p. 28) proposed to substitute *γαῦρα* for *φαῦλα*, but there is no ground whatever for suspecting the text of Sophocles. Blaydes boldly suggested *τὰ μεγάλα*.—For the periphrasis with *ἔχω* see on fr. 489.

42

ἔσπεισα βαιᾶς κύλικος ὥστε δεύτερα

42 Schol. Soph. *O. T.* 750 (cod. Flor. G ed. Dind. p. 42) *βαιός· ἰδίως ἀντὶ τοῦ* <*εἷς*> *ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν* '*ἔσπεισα...δευτέρα.*' Suid. *s.v. βαιαί...καὶ βαιός· ἰδίως ἀντὶ τοῦ εἷς Σοφοκλῆς·* '*πότερον*' *κτέ.* (*O. T.* 750) *καὶ ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν* '*ἔσπεισα...δευτέρα.*' Here belongs a badly corrupted gloss of Hesych. 1 p. 353 *βαιόν· ὀλίγον, μικρόν. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Οἰδίποδι Τυράννῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄφθονος καὶ πολλός.* (*ἀντὶ τοῦ ἃ ἐπιφέρει γὰρ* '*ἢ πολλούς*' M. Schmidt) *γράμμα Βαιθήλ οἶκος θεοῦ. βαιών· ἐκβαλών. καὶ ἐν Αἰχμαλώτισι βαῖον, ἐν* (*βαιόν· ἐν* M. Schmidt).

The words *ὥστε δεύτερα* are meaningless as they stand and probably, though not certainly, corrupt. Bergk proposed *ὥστε δευτέραν* with *σπονδήν* in the following line (M. Schmidt reports him as proposing *δευτέρας*), and Bernhardy *ὡς τὰ δεύτερα.* But Herwerden's elegant *εἶτα δευτέρας* is much more attractive, if any change is to be made: there must have been such a context as to make the meaning 'one, single' at least a possibility for *βαιᾶς* (*e.g. οὐδὲ δευτέρα* < *παρῆν* >). — **βαιᾶς** is used of size as in *Phil.* 286 *βαιᾷ τῇδ' ὑπὸ στέγῃ.* Aesch. *Pers.* 451 *νῆσος βαιά.* Cf. Lycophr. fr. 3 *ἐκ βραχείας δαιτὸς ἡ βαιὰ κύλιξ.*

43

Μύνου τ' Ἐπιστρόφου τε

43 *τε* Gaisford: *γε* codd.

43 Schol. A Hom. O 302 *τὸ γοῦν Μύνης ὁ μὲν ποιητὴς περιττοσυλλάβως ἔκλινεν...ὁ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἰσοσυλλάβως* '*Μύνου τ' Ἐπιστρόφου γε*' To the same effect Eustath. *Il.* p. 1017, 10, who attributes the genitive *Μύνου* to Sophocles. The name of the play is given by Choerob. *in Theodos.* p. 140, 5 = p. 158, 13 Hilgard *Μύνης Μύνου καὶ Μύνητος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Σοφοκλῆς Μύνου ἔκλινεν ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν εἰπών* '*Μύνου τι Ἐπιστρέφου γε,*' *ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς ἀναλόγως Μύνητος.*

Mynes and Epistrophus were brothers, sons of Euenus and grandsons of Selepus. Mynes was king of Lyrnessus and husband of Briseis. Both brothers were slain by Achilles when he sacked the town, and Briseis became the *γέρας* of the conqueror. The Homeric passages are B 691 *Λυρνησσὸν διαπορθήσας καὶ τείχεα Θήβης,* | *κὰδ δὲ Μύνητ' ἔβαλεν καὶ Ἐπιστροφον ἐγχεσιμώρους,* | *υἱέας Εὐηνοῖο Σελημιάδαο ἄνακτος,* and T 295 (lament of Briseis over Patroclus) *ὅτ' ἄνδρ' ἐμὸν ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεὺς* | *ἔκτεινεν, πέρσεν δὲ πόλιν θείοιο Μύνητος.* Strabo 612 draws the inference that Lyrnessus was the town of Mynes, since Thebe is excluded as being the stronghold of Eetion. Both were in the south of the Troad on the Adramyttian plain.

44

πατὴρ δὲ χρυσδὺς ἀμφίλινα κρούπαλα

44 Hesych. 1 p. 162 *ἀμφίλινα κρούπαλα· Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσι* (*Αἰχμαλώτησι* cod.)· '*πατὴρ...κρούπαλα.*'

This obscure and corrupt fragment still awaits elucidation. The attention of critics has been directed chiefly to the correction of the meaningless *χρυσδύς*: Musurus conjectured *χρύσε' εἰσδύς*, leaving the beginning of the line doubtful, Bergk *Χρύσης ἀμφιλεγεῖ* or *Χρυσηίδος ἀμφίλινα*, M. Schmidt *πατὴρ λέχρις δὲς* ('putting on his boots awry!'), and M. Mayer *πατὴρ δ' ὑπεκδὺς* (*ὑπεσδὺς* Diels). Campbell sought at the same time to set right the prosody of *ἀμφίλινα* by reading *πατὴρ δὲ Χρύσης ἀμφίλινα κράσπεδα*, *i.e.* 'the wool-enwreathed edge of the fillet on his sceptre,' in reference to Hom.

A 14 f. Headlam (*J. P.* XXX 316), followed by J. M. Edmonds in *C. R.* XXVII 4, endeavours to defend the long ι of *ἀμφίλινα* by Antiph. fr. 49 II 30 K. (Athen. 455 F) *τυφαλίδας τε λινοσάρκους· μανθάνεις; τυρὸν λέγω* and other passages, but the evidence is too weak to count against the numerous instances to the contrary. However this may be, it is improbable that Campbell was right in eliminating the reference to some kind of shoe: Hesych. II p. 540 has *κρούπανα· ξύλινα ὑποδήματα*, but *κρούπεζαι* is the better-supported term (Cratin. fr. 310 I 103 K. *οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν συοβοιωτοί, κρουπεζοφόρον γένος ἀνδρῶν*). If this be so, it is worth considering the suggestion of M. Mayer that the line refers to Priam, making an attempt to escape from the Greeks. But *ὑπεκδύς* will not account for *χρυσδύς*, and I cannot help thinking that the corrupt word conceals an allusion to the elaborately fashioned shoes of the oriental monarch with their decoration of gold. So *χρυσεοσάνδαλον ἴχνος* of Helen and of the Muses in Eur. *Or.* 1468, *I. A.* 1042. Pollux 7. 86, 92 mentions *σάνδαλα Τυρρηνικά* as having wooden soles and gilded straps, and adds that Phidias represented Athena as wearing them. Duris (*FHG* II 477) ap. Athen. 535 F, describing the shoe of Demetrius Poliorcetes: *τούτῳ δὲ χρυσοῦ πολλὴν ἐνύφαινον ποικιλίαν ὀπίσω καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐνιέντες οἱ τεχνῖται.* Parrhasius had golden shoe-buckles: Athen. 543 F. *ἀμφίλινα* would refer to thongs of linen, fastening the shoes round the ankles, and themselves embroidered with gold. The metre might be patched with *χρυσᾶ πατὴρ δὺς ἀμφίλινά <τε> κρούπαλα*, but the corruption probably lies deeper.

45

ἄχνην Λυδῆς κερκίδος

45 Λυδὶς cod.: corr. Musurus

45 Hesych. I p. 345 *ἄχνην Λυδῆς κερκίδος. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτοις. ἄχνην τὸ ἄκρον κατὰ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἄκρως ἔχον, ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θαλασσίας ἀχνης· ἔστι γὰρ λαμπρὰ καὶ διαφανής. γράφεται δὲ καὶ ἴχνη.* M. Schmidt holds that the last words have nothing to do with Sophocles at all, but refer to the place called Ἴχναι in Hdt. 7. 123, of which Steph. Byz. says: Ἴχνη πόλις Μακεδονίας...Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ Ἄχνας αὐτήν φησι. They do not appear in *Proverb. Append.* I. 44 *ἄχνη Λυδῆς κερκίδος· τὸ ἄκρον, ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἄκρως ἔχειν, ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θαλαττίας ἄχνης.* It is idle to emend *ἴχνη* (*ἠχήν* Nauck formerly, *ἀκμήν* Blaydes).

The most comprehensive gloss on *ἄχνη* is in *Etym. M.* p. 181, 50 *ἄχνη πᾶσα λεπτότης ὑγροῦ τε καὶ ξηροῦ.* Cf. Suid. *s.v. καὶ ἄχνη ἁλός, τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ ὕδατος, ὁ ἀφρὸς τῆς θαλάσσης.* This will explain its use for teardrops (*Trach.* 849), for dew (*O. C.* 681), for spray from the sea (Hom. Δ 426), for smoke (Aesch. fr. 336), and for chaff (Hom. E 499). The colloquial use in Ar. *Vesp.* 92 corresponds: *ἢν δ' οὖν καταμύσῃ κἀν ἄχνην*— 'even a *wink*.' Here the reference is to the delicacy or glossiness of the material: 'the *fine-spun* product of the Lydian shuttle.' There is no reason to find fault with Hesychius' explanation, but the suggestion that this use of *ἄχνη* arises by direct transference from the meaning *spray* is unnecessary. *ἄκρως* is a common word in the scholia to Sophocles: see schol. *O. T.* 118, *O. C.* 1695. Hippocrates used *ἄχνη* for fluff or shreds of linen, the substance of lint: Erotian p. 50, 12 *ἄχνη ὀθονίου· τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν λεγόμενον ξύσμα, ἐξ οὗ γίγνεται μοτός.* So *ἄχνη λίνου* Hesych., *Etym. M.*, Suid., Bekk. *anecd.* p. 474, 29.

Richness and luxuriousness of dress are often attributed to the Lydians, whose fashions were copied by the Ionians of Asia Minor at the time when Sardis was the capital of Croesus. Cf. Aesch. fr. 59 *ὅστις χιτῶνας βασσάρας τε Λυδίας | ἔχει ποδήρεις*, Xenophanes fr. 3 *ἀβροσύνας δὲ μαθόντες ἀνωφελέας παρὰ Λυδῶν...ἦεσαν εἰς ἀγορὴν παναλουργέα φάρε' ἔχοντες.* There is a double implication, Lydian ornament as well as Lydian harmony, in Pind. *Nem.* 8. 15 *Λυδίαν μίτραν κανακαδὰ πεποικιλμέναν*, although it is not recognized by the editors. Hence Ar. *Ach.* 112 (Blaydes) etc.—**Λυδῆς**, here for *Λυδίας*. So conversely *Λυδία* for *Λυδή* in *Trach.* 432.

Welcker interpreted the words as referring to the clothing in which Astyanax was buried: see Introductory Note. Cf. *Ἰστριανίδων ὕφη* fr. 210, 67.

46

Σαρπηδὼν ἀκτή

46 Herodian π. μον. λεξ. p. 9, 10 Σαρπηδών Σαρπηδόνος, εἴτε ὁ ἥρως, εἴτε ἡ πέτρα, εἴτε ἡ ἀκτή, εἴτε ἡ νῆσος· ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν (cod. -τῆσιν) εἴρηται Σαρπηδὼν ἀκτή.

Other authorities for the Sarpedonian promontory are Hesych. IV p. 12 Σαρπηδὼν ἀκτή· ἀντὶ τοῦ Σαρπηδονία. τόπος δέ οὗτος Θράκης ἀεὶ κλύδωνας ἔχων καὶ κυματιζόμενος, ἱερὸν Ποσειδῶνος. The same words occur in Zenob. 5. 86. Phot. *lex.* p. 502, 3 = Suid. *s.v.* Σαρπηδὼν ἀκτή· ἄκρα τῆς Θρᾴκης· Κράτης τὴν μεγάλην. The last words mean, I suppose, that Crates of Mallus described Sarpedonia as 'the great' promontory. Its position, between the mouth of the Hebrus and the Thracian Chersonese, is fixed by Strabo 331 fr. 52. Cf. Hdt. 7. 58.

Sarpedon is both a personal and a place name, and Sarpedon, the son of Poseidon, who is to be distinguished from his famous namesake, the son of Zeus, was the eponymous hero of the Thracian promontory (schol. Eur. *Rhes.* 29). He was slain by Heracles on his return from Troy (Apollod. 2. 105). The occurrence of the name in these parts has been connected with other evidence of the settlement of Cretans on the N. coasts of the Aegean (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 209). Our authorities also mention a rocky island Sarpedon in the Ocean stream, which was the home of the Gorgons: see *Cypr.* fr. 21 (*EGF* p. 31). See further on fr. 637.

47

αἰχμέλετος

47 αἰχμόδετος cod.: corr. Meineke

47 Hesych. I p. 89 αἰχμίδετος· αἰχμάλωτος. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτισιν (αἰχμαλώτησιν cod.).

Nauck prefers to read αἰχμώλετος, which is found in *Etym. M.* p. 41, 3 λέγεται καὶ αἰχμάλωτος καὶ αἰχμώλετος. The word would be well enough (cf. δορικανής, δορυμανής), but could not have been g'ossed by αἰχμάλωτος; and it is out of place in *Etym. M.*, where it has probably taken the place of αἰχμόδετος or αἰχμέλετος. I prefer the latter, which is due to Meineke's conjecture: cf. δορίλητος, δορίκτητος, δοριάλωτος. If αἰχμόδετος is right, it is a very unusual compound, since the first member should express an instrument rather than a cause. Ellendt seems to be conscious of this when he renders *hasta ligatus*, but the meaning required is of course 'bound in war' (L. and S.).

48

ἀλιτρία

48 Hesych. I p. 124 ἀλιτροσύνη· ἁμαρτία. καὶ ἀλιτρία Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτοις (l. Αἰχμαλωτίσιν) λέγει.

The word is a rare one, and only occurs elsewhere in Ar. *Ach.* 907 ἅπερ πίθακον ἀλιτρίας πολλὰς πλέων, —a monkey full of *mischief*. Hence Bekk. *anecd.* p. 377, 6 (Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 76, 1) and Suid. ἀλιτρία ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁμαρτία Ἀριστοφάνης.

Dindorf proposed to restore ἀλιτρίαις in *O. C.* 371, but, as Jebb remarked, the lengthening of the second syllable would not be permissible. Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 445 points out that the cognate ἀλιτήριος is a word of grave import, and it may be inferred that in *Ach.* l.c. ἀλιτρία is mock-heroic (= *steeped in sin*).

49

ἀνηκές

49 Hesych. I p. 199 *ἀηκές· ἀῆκον. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν. ἀνηκές*, which is required by the alphabetical order, was restored by Musurus, and *ἀνήκεστον* (for *ἀῆκον*) by Pierson on Moer. p. 78, who compares *πανακής*, and the glosses *προσακές* and *ληθηκές*. This is better than M. Schmidt's suggestion *ἀνηβές· ἄνηβον*. *ἀνηκής* does not occur elsewhere, but is related to *ἄκος* as *ἀπαθής* to *πάθος*, *δυσμενής* to *μένος*, *ἀναγής* to *ἄγος*, *ἀσθενής* to *σθένος* etc. The long vowel, for which see Monro *H. G.*[2] § 125 (8), is due to the influence of *ἀνήκεστον*. Cf. Moeris p. 191, 21 *ἀνακές ὀξυτόνως Ἀττικοί, ὡς καὶ Εὔπολις Αἴξιν* (fr. 21 I 263 K.), *ἀθεράπευτον Ἕλληνες*.

50

ἀπειθής

50 Hesych. I p. 230 *ἀπειθής· ἀνυπότακτος, ἄπιστος* (*ἄπειστος* conj. Nauck: see on fr. 627). *Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν* (*-ώτησιν* cod.).

This word is not extant elsewhere in tragedy, though otherwise common enough. Matthiae on Eur. *Or.* 31 exploded the view that *ἀπιθής* was the Attic form. Pindar employed *ἀπειθής* as an epithet of *τύχη* (fr. 40).

51

ἀρτάνη

51 Bekk. *anecd.* p. 447, 7 *ἀρτάνη κυρίως μὲν ἡ <διὰ>* (so Ellendt: *ἀπὸ* Blaydes) *τῶν καλῳδίων ἀγχόνη, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσμοῦ*. Hesych. I p. 291 *ἀρτάνη· ἡ διὰ καλῳδίων ἀγχόνη, <Σοφοκλῆς δ'> ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν* (*ἢ αἰχμαλώτησις* cod.) *ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσμοῦ*. To these *testimonia* should be added *Etym. M.* p. 150, 2 *ἀρτάνη· ἡ ἐκ τῶν καλῳδίων ἀγχόνη, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ <ἐν Αἰχμαλωτίσιν> ἐπὶ δεσμοῦ, ἐν Ἀντιγόνῃ* (v. 54) *'πλεκταῖσιν ἀρτάναισιν' ἀγχόναις*. The reason for the supplement will appear presently.

ἀρτάνη means a *rope*, *noose*, and is always applied by Aesch. and Soph. (it does not occur in Eur.) to a death by hanging. It must not be supposed that in the *Αἰχμαλωτίδες* Soph. was referring to a rope used for any other purpose, although at first sight such an inference might appear legitimate. For the artificial character of the note can be tested by the scholia. Thus on *O. T.* 1266 *χαλᾷ κρεμαστὴν ἀρτάνην* we have *ἀρτάνην*] *δεσμόν·..τὴν ἀναρτητικήν* (*i.e. κρεμαστήν*)· *κυρίως δὲ ἀρτάνη λέγεται ἡ ἐκ τῶν καλῳδίων ἀγχόνη*, but on *Ant.* 54 *πλεκταῖσιν ἀρτάναισι λωβᾶται βίον* the comment is *ἀρτάναισι*] *ἀγχόναις*. The annotator selects arbitrarily one or the other of the fixed synonyms.

52

ἄσεπτον

52 Hesych. I p. 297 *ἄσεπτον· ἀσεβές. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν* (*αἰχμαλώτοις* cod.). Cf. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 451, 19 *ἄσεπτον· τὸ ἀσεβές*.

ἄσεπτος (whence *ἀσεπτεῖν Ant.* 1350) occurs also in *O. T.* 890 *εἰ μὴ τῶν ἀσέπτων ἔρξεται*, and in Eur. *Hel.* 543, *Bacch.* 890, *I. A.* 1092. It belongs to the list of verbals in *-τος* collected on fr. 210, 8 which have an active, or at any rate not a passive force.

Tucker restores *ἄσεπτ'* for *ἀεπτ'* (vulg. *ἄελπτ'*) in Aesch. *Suppl.* 920 (876).

53

ἐμπλεύρου

53 Hesych. II p. 80 ἐμπλεύρου· ἐνάλλου εἰς (ἐναλούεις cod.) τὰς πλευράς. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν (-ώτησιν cod.).

There is no other trace of the existence of ἐμπλευροῦν. The meaning would seem to be 'dash against his ribs,' 'charge him,' if we may judge by the usage of ἐνάλλεσθαι, for which cf. Plut. *Lucull.* 11 τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον, εἰς τὴν γαστέρα ἐναλλομένου, *non posse suav. vivi sec. Epic.* 2 εἰς τὴν γαστέρα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἔοικας ἐναλεῖσθαι. Blaydes proposes ἐμπλευροῦ, in place of ἐμπλεύρου. At first sight this is plausible, but it appears that ἐμπλευροῦν follows the analogy of γναθοῦν (Bekk. *anecd.* p. 87, 9 γναθοῖ· ἀντὶ τοῦ τὴν γνάθον τύπτει. Φρύνιχος Μονοτρόπῳ. Hesych. I p. 437), κεφαλαιοῦν (Marc. *ev.* 12. 4), and the Homeric γυιοῦν.

54

ἐνόπαις

54 ἐνώταις cod.: corr. Bentley

54 Hesych. II p. 112 ἐνώταις· ἐνωτίοις. τῇ προσωδίᾳ ὡς φιλόπαις. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν (-ώτησιν cod.). *Etym. M.* p. 344, 47 ἐνοπαῖς· τοῖς ἐνωτίοις· ἀπὸ τοῦ <ἐν> ταῖς τῶν ὤτων ὀπαῖς κεῖσθαι Σοφοκλῆς.

ἐνόπαις was restored by Bentley on Hor. *Carm.* I 9. 7. In place of φιλόπαις Heinsius conjectured διόπαις, a word also meaning *earrings* and found in Ar. fr. 320, 10 (I 474 K.). For the wearing of earrings by women in Homeric times see Ξ 182 and Leaf *in loc.* In the classical period the practice was extremely common, and is attested by a variety of names, such as ἐνώτια (also ἐνῴδια on inscrr.), πλάστρα, ἑλικτῆρες, and (later) ἑλλόβια. See Iwan Mueller, *Privatalterthümer*², p. 111; *Dict. Ant.* I 1002. For the compounds from ὀπή, 'hole,' see Sturtevant in *Class. Phil.* VII 422.

55

ἐπιμάσσεται

55 Hesych. II p. 160 ἐπιμάσσεται· ἐπαύξεται ἐπὶ πλέον, ἀπὸ τοῦ μάσσονος, ὅ ἐστι μακροτέρου. οἱ δὲ ἐφάψεται, ψηλαφήσει. ἢ οἷον οὐ λιμώσσει, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσεπιμάσσεται πλείω. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν (-ώτησιν cod.).

Three interpretations are given, of which the last was emended by Reiske with λιμώξει and προσεπιμασήσεται. In the absence of context we cannot tell why Sophocles' use of the word was obscure, but Dindorf is justified in his view that the second explanation is alone correct. If that is so, Sophocles adopted the Homeric future of ἐπιμαίομαι in the same sense which it bears in Δ 190 ἕλκος δ' ἰητὴρ ἐπιμάσσεται ἠδ' ἐπιθήσει | φάρμακα. L. and S., on the other hand, refer it to ἐπιμάσσω, *to knead again*: but in *A. P.* 7. 730 Stadtmueller returns to the MS reading πατὴρ | δεξιτερᾷ κεφαλὰν ἐπεμάσσατο (ἐπεμάξατο Reiske, ἐπιμάσσεται Jacobs), and ἐπιμάσσω should perhaps disappear from the lexicons (ἔτι μάττων is read in schol. Ar. *Pac.* 14).

56

Ἴαννα

56 Hesych. II p. 338 Ἴαννα· *ἐν μὲν Αἰχμαλωτίσι* (·ὡτησι cod.) *Σοφοκλέους ἀπέδοσαν Ἑλληνική, ἐπεὶ* (*ἐπὶ* cod.) *Ἴαννας τοὺς Ἕλληνας λέγουσιν· ἐν δὲ Τριπτολέμῳ* (fr. 617) *ἐπὶ γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ποιμέσι* (fr. 519). *τινὲς δὲ τὴν Ἑλένην. ἐπιεικῶς δὲ οἱ βάρβαροι τοὺς Ἕλληνας Ἴωνας λέγουσιν* (*λέγουσι μὲν* cod.), *καὶ ἐν Τρωΐλῳ* (fr. 631) *βάρβαρον θρήνημα τὸ ἰαί. ἢ ὄνομα γυναικός.*

To orientals who came in contact with them, and especially to the Persians, the Greeks were known as Ἴωνες, Ἰάονες, Ἰᾶνες. Hence Ar. *Ach.* 104 *οὐ λῆψι χρῦσο, χαυνόπρωκτ'* Ἰαοναῦ with the schol.: *πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας Ἰάονας οἱ βάρβαροι ἐκάλουν.* Aesch. *Pers.* 181 Ἰαόνων γῆν οἴχεται πέρσαι θέλων, *ib.* 952 Ἰάνων γὰρ ἀπηύρα, Ἰάνων ναύφρακτος Ἄρης, *ib.* 1014, 1027. There is the same intention in *Suppl.* 71 Ἰαονίοισι νόμοισι, where the schol. has rightly *ἀντὶ τοῦ φωνῇ Ἑλληνικῇ*, but the editors have sought for a more subtle explanation, forgetting that the Danaids are as much foreigners as the Persians. Timoth. *Pers.* 161 Ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων, where the curious broken Greek of the Persian is quoted. The prevalence of the archaic form indicates an attempt to represent the Persian pronunciation: 'in Persian all Greeks were called Yauna' (Starkie on *Ach.* l. c.). The effeminacy of the Asiatic Ionians prejudiced their kinsmen in Greece against the name: Hdt. I 143 *οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι Ἴωνες καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔφυγον τὸ οὔνομα, οὐ βουλόμενοι Ἴωνες κεκλῆσθαι.* In the extract from Hesych. it is stated that Sophocles used Ἴαννα (1) as an adj.=Ἑλληνική in the *Αἰχμαλωτίδες*, (2) as a description of a Greek woman, or specifically of Helen, in the *Triptolemus* and Ποιμένες. In place of Ἴαννας it seems almost certain that we ought to read Ἰᾶνας with L. Dindorf, Lobeck, and others (Ἰάονας Casaubon). Similarly, Lobeck (*Path. Prol.* p. 32) would give Ἰάνη (or Ἰάννα, as Ellendt prefers) in place of Ἴαννα in the lemma. Blaydes strangely prefers Ἴαινα.

57

ἱερόλας

57 Hesych. II p. 347 ἱερόλας· *ἴσισυς. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτοις. ὡς καὶ τὸν γέροντα γεροιδὰν ἢ γεροῦντος λέγει* (*λέγουσι* conj. Blaydes).

For *ἴσισυς* Heringa restored *ἱερεύς*, and nothing better has been suggested. For *γεροιδάν* J. Pearson conjectured *γεροίταν*, altering *ἱερόλας* to *ἱερόιτας* accordingly, and this view, so far as concerns *γεροίταν*, was approved by Lobeck (*Path. Prol.* p. 387). On the other hand, Dindorf proposed *γηρόλαν* to correspond with the lemma. *ἢ γεροῦντος* baffles the critics altogether, and is rejected by M. Schmidt as a marginal gloss. Heringa's *ἢ γεροντίαν* has no probability. It should be added that a few lines before the MS of Hesychius gives *ἱερόμας· τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμελούμενος.* Musurus restored *ἱεροκόμος*, but M. Schmidt combines it with the present gloss thus: *ἱερόλας· τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμελούμενος. 'ἱερόλας ἴσισυς' Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσι, ὃς καὶ τὸν γηρῶντα γηρόλαν λέγει.* But what is *ἴσισυς*? *ἱερόλας* may be right, but it belongs to a class of words more appropriate to comedy than tragedy, and, if used by Sophocles, was probably contemptuous. The best-known of its cognates are *μαιόλης* (Sappho), and *σκωπτόλης* (Ar. *Vesp.* 788); some are mere vulgarisms, such as *ὀξόλης*, *οἰφόλης*, *σιφόλης*, *κορυπτόλης*, *ὀπυιόλης*; *κοιόλης*, said to mean a *priest*, is obscure. Lobeck (*Phrynichus*, p. 613; *Path. Prol.* p. 129) adds the proper names Μισγόλας, Ἀργόλας, Φειδόλας, Πυθόλης. The formation, though not primitive (Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.* II p. 211), is not compounded from ὅλλυμι.

58

ἱκτορεύσομεν

58 Hesych. II p. 354 ἱκτερεύσομεν· ἱκετεύσομεν. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλώτοις. Is. Voss restored ἱκτορεύσομεν. *ibid.* p. 352 ἱκετορεύσομεν· ἱκετεύσομεν. This verb is derived from the form ἵκτωρ, which appears also in the compounds ἀφίκτωρ and προσίκτωρ.

59

στερνόμαντις

59 Pollux 2. 162 καὶ στερνόμαντιν Σοφοκλῆς τὸν καλούμενον ἐγγαστρίμυθον. Hesych. II p. 107 ἐνστερνομαντίαις· ἐγγαστριμύθοις. Σοφοκλῆς Αἰχμαλωτίσιν: no doubt this is rightly corrected by Nauck to στερνομάντιες· ἐγγαστρίμυθοι. Suid. *s.v.* ἐγγαστρίμυθος. ἐγγαστρίμαντις ὃν νῦν τινες Πύθωνα, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ στερνόμαντιν. Schol. Plat. *Soph.* 252 C ἐγγαστρίμυθος δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἐν γαστρὶ μαντευόμενος. τοῦτον τὸν ἐγγαστρίμαντιν νῦν τινὲς Πύθωνά φασι, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ στερνόμαντιν. Phot. *epist.* 64 p. 368 Σοφοκλῆς δὲ...στερνόμαντιν μετωνόμασεν. Considerable notoriety was acquired at Athens during the time of the Peloponnesian war by a ventriloquist named Eurycles, who professed the power of divination by means of a familiar spirit. Hence Aristophanes producing his plays through others compares himself to Eurycles: *Vesp.* 1019 μιμησάμενος τὴν Εὐρυκλέους μαντείαν καὶ διάνοιαν, | ὥστ' ἀλλοτρίας γαστέρας ἐνδὺς κωμῳδικὰ πολλὰ χέασθαι. Plat. *Soph.* 252 C says that the opponents of predication are convicted out of their own mouths: ἐντὸς ὑποφθεγγόμενον ὥσπερ τὸν ἄτοπον Εὐρυκλέα περιφέροντες ἀεὶ πορεύονται. Cf. Plut. *de l. ur.* 9 p. 414 E εὔηθες γάρ ἐστι καὶ παιδικὸν κομιδῇ τὸ οἴεσθαι τὸν θεὸν αὐτὸν ὥσπερ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους, Εὐρυκλέας πάλαι νυνὶ δὲ Πύθωνας προσαγορευομένους, ἐνδυόμενον εἰς τὰ σώματα τῶν προφητῶν ὑποφθέγγεσθαι, τοῖς ἐκείνων στόμασι καὶ φωναῖς χρώμενον ὀργάνοις. Aristid. I 30 Dind., speaking of the inspiration of Dionysus, ἀκριβέστερον Εὐρυκλέους τἄνδοθεν καταλαμβάνων, indicates, in the same way as Plutarch, that Eurycles was a generic name given to spirits temporarily occupying the body of a man. There is nothing in these passages which is not satisfied by the simple inference that Eurycles alleged his oracles to be the voice of a demon lodged in his own breast. So schol. Plat.: Εὐρυκλῆς γὰρ ἐδόκει δαίμονά τινα ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ ἔχειν, τὸν ἐγκελευόμενον αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων λέγειν, and schol. Aristoph.: τἀληθῆ μαντευόμενος διὰ τοῦ ἐνυπάρχοντος αὐτῷ δαίμονος. Such a proceeding corresponds exactly with the methods of savage magicians, as reported by E. B. Tylor in *Encycl. Brit.*[9] VII 63: 'cheating sorcerers use *ventriloquism* of the original kind, which (as its name implies) is supposed to be caused by the voice of a demon inside the body of the speaker, who really himself talks in a feigned human voice, or in squeaking or whistling tones thought suitable to the thin-bodied spirit-visitor.' It is unnecessary therefore to suppose that Eurycles was a ventriloquist in any other sense, or to accept Campbell's inference (on Plat. *l.c.*) that 'he made his voice sound as if from within the person consulting him.' For further information see Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 928 1.

ΑΚΡΙΣΙΟΣ

Jacobs identified this play with the *Danae*, supposing that it had an alternative title; and Welcker (p. 349) was inclined to agree with him, while reserving the possibility that the same material was used over again by Sophocles for the production of a satyr-play. It should be added that Meineke (on *O. C.* p. 275) also held that the *Danae* was a satyr-play, but there is little to justify the assumption[1]. Alternative titles are not common and should only be accepted where the evidence is quite clear, as in the case of the Φρύγες or Ἕκτορος λύτρα of Aeschylus (*TGF* p. 84). Besides, it is not likely that a play would be named alternatively after one or other of the principal characters. It would be more natural to suppose that the citation of the play as *Danae* was a *mistake*, due to the identity of the subject-matter with that of Euripides' *Danae* and the greater celebrity of the latter. For similar errors see Introduction, § 1. It must, however, be admitted that the error, if such it was, was more persistent than is usually the case, and had infected even the best critical tradition.

Brunck, on the other hand, considered that the *Acrisius* must be identified with the *Larissaei*, and that its subject was the accidental killing of Acrisius by Perseus when throwing the discus. The variation of title would be more natural than in the other case, but Jacobs appears to be justified in arguing that frs. 64 and 65, at any rate, are more suitable to the story of Danae. See also Escher in Pauly-Wissowa IV 2086.

If the identification of the *Acrisius* with the *Danae* is correct, it contained the story up to the time of the discovery of the birth of Perseus, when Acrisius sent mother and child adrift on the Aegean in a λάρναξ. Perseus was known to Hesiod as the son of Danae (*Scut.* 216), and is mentioned as the son of Zeus and Danae in Hom. Ξ 319 f. The fullest and best account of the legend depends on the authority of Pherecydes in schol. Ap. Rhod. 4. 1091, 1515 (*FHG* I 75). Sophocles refers to the imprisonment of Danae in the brazen chamber in *Ant.* 944. There may be a reference to our play in Menand. *Sam.* 244 *οὐκ ἀκήκοας λεγόντων, εἰπέ μοι, Νικήρατε, | τῶν τραγῳδῶν, ὡς γενόμενος χρυσὸς ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρύη | διὰ τέγους, κατειργμένην δὲ παῖδ' ἐμοίχευσέν ποτε;*

[1] See n. on fr. 165. Meineke also relied on frs. 166, 167.

60

ὡς ἐπιψάλλειν βίδην τε καὶ ξυναυλίαν

60 ὥστ' coni. Ellendt | ἐπιψᾶ cod. : corr. Musurus | βίδηνται cod. : cor. Maussacus

60 Hesych. 1 p. 375 *βιδην· εἶδος. κροῦμα.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρ<ισίῳ>…'ὡς… ξυναυλίαν'· ἄλλοι *βίθυν*. For the last word, which is otherwise unknown, Nauck conj. *βίδην*, comparing *ibid.* p. 405 *βυδοί· οἱ μουσικοὶ ἢ κροῦμά τι. σοφῶς κρησίν* (corrected by Fungius to Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ). Nauck thinks the second passage undoubtedly belongs here, but Dindorf, while admitting this to be possible, prints it also under the title *Κρίσις* as fr. 332 of his edition. Nauck's view is the more probable.

βίδην, if that is the right reading, evidently puzzled the copyists as is shown by the variants recorded above. If *κροῦμα* is the correct explanation, it means a note played on a musical instrument, strictly on the lyre; and *ἐπιψάλλειν* shows that the lyre is in question here. But what kind of a note? No answer can be given, and it is idle to enquire whether *βίδην*, *βίδην*, *βίθυν* or some other form should be preferred, since they are all equally obscure. *βίζην* obviously suggests itself, but, although it is sometimes explained by *ἱκανῶς* (Hesych., *Etym. M.*), there is no trustworthy evidence of its usage otherwise than as = *confertim*. Hartung, who supposes that *βίδην* was a by-form of *βίζην*, is certainly not justified in rendering it 'in muffled tones.' *ἐπιψάλλειν* is probably only a strengthened form of *ψάλλειν* = 'to play on the lyre,' as in Pollux 4. 58: there is no authority for L. and S.'s translation 'to *accompany* with the lyre.' Blaydes conjectured *ὥσπερεὶ | ψάλλοι* (or *ὡς ἐπίσταται | ψάλλειν*), with *εἶδος κρούματος* in the gloss.

ξυναυλίαν has various meanings which are not adequately distinguished in the lexicons. (1) The concerted playing of lyre and flute: Athen. 617 F illustrates this from Ephippus fr. 7 (II 254 K.). So schol. Ar. *Eq.* 9 ξυναυλία λέγεται *ὅταν κιθάρα καὶ αὐλὸς συμφωνῇ*, schol. Greg. Naz. II p. 106 *λέγομεν δὲ συναυλίαν καὶ κιθάρας ἅμα συγκρουομένης αὐλῷ καὶ συμφθεγγομένης*. (2) A symphony of flutes: schol. Ar. *l.c.* ξυναυλία καλεῖται *ὅταν δύο αὐληταὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγωσιν*. Hesych. III p. 172 *τὴν ὑπὸ δύο ἐπιτελουμένην αὔλησιν*. Pollux 4. 83 *Ἀθήνησι δὲ καὶ συναυλία τις ἐκαλεῖτο· συμφωνία τις αὕτη τῶν ἐν Παναθηναίοις συναυλούντων*. (3) The accompaniment of the voice by the flute, differing from *αὐλῳδία* in this respect, that no articulate words were sung. Such appears to be the meaning of the definition given by Semus ap. Athen. 618 A *ἣν τις ἀγὼν συμφωνίας ἀμοιβαίος αὐλοῦ καὶ ῥυθμοῦ χωρὶς λόγου τοῦ προσμελῳδοῦντος*. To the same effect but less precisely Pollux 4. 83 *οἱ δὲ τὴν συναυλίαν εἶδος προσαιλήσεως οἴονται ὡς τὴν αὐλῳδίαν*. The best account of the word is to be found in Hemsterhuis on Lucian *dial. mar.* 3. 2, who proceeds to show that it is often used figuratively to express *consent* or *harmony*. So far as it is possible to judge, Soph. appears to have used the word in the first sense. The verse is a trochaic tetrameter with an iambus wanting at the end.

61

XO. *βοᾷ τις, ὦ· ἀκούετ'; ἢ μάτην ὑλακτῶ; πάντα γάρ τοι τῷ φοβουμένῳ ψοφεῖ.*

61. 3 πάντα SMA: ἅπαντα vulgo

61 Stob. *flor.* 8. 2 (III p. 340, 13 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀκρίσιος. *βοᾷ … ψοφεῖ.* Codex S of Stobaeus alone prefixes to the extract the symbol of the Chorus.

The fragment has been assailed by many critics. Thus, Hermann endeavoured to restore two senarii by reading ἐλῶ for ὑλακτῶ; Oakford, Conington, G. H. Mueller and Naber conjectured ὡς ἀκούετ' and Cobet προ ἐλακτῶ for ὦ ἀκούετ', and for ἢ μάτην ἐλακτῶ Porson substituted ἢ λάτκω μάτην, Halm ἢ μάτην κλέω, Naber ἢ μάτην καλῶ, Vater ἢ μάτην

κτυπεῖ, Nauck ἢ μάτην ἀλυκτῶ. Wecklein approved the restoration of βοᾷ τις· οὐκ ἀκούετ'; ἢ μάτην κλύω; ἅπαντα κτέ. Hense thinks the original may have run ἀκούετ' <ὦ γυναῖκες>; ἢ μάτην κτέ., and accepts the vulgate ἅπαντα. They quote *El.* 1406 βοᾷ τις ἔνδον· οὐκ ἀκούετ', ὦ φίλαι; The objection taken to **μάτην ὑλακτῶ** appears to be ill-founded, and the connexion is, 'Do ye hear? Or am I but an idle babbler? For in my fear it may be that I hear a sound where there is none.' H., who justifies the text, quotes for μάτην ὑλακτεῖν Aesch. *Ag.* 1672 ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων (Clytaemnestra of the Chorus). Plat. *legg.* 967 C τοὺς φιλοσοφοῦντας κυσὶ ματαίαις ἀπεικάζοντας χρωμέναισιν ὑλακαῖς. Tryphiod. 421 (of Cassandra) μάτην ὑλάουσα. Dion Cass. 46. 26 πολλὰ γοῦν καὶ μάτην ὑλακτεῖς. So μαψυλάκας in Pind. *Nem.* 7. 105, and μαψυλάκαν γλῶσσαν in Sappho fr. 27. Observe the appropriateness of the metaphor from a dog barking at a sound or shadow by night. 'To fear a sound' was proverbial (note τοι in v. 3) of a nervous or baseless fright: cf. fr. 314, 139. Hence Eur. *Phoen.* 269 ὠὴ τίς οὗτος; ἢ κτύπον φοβούμεθα; | ἅπαντα γὰρ τολμῶσι δεινὰ φαίνεται, which closely resembles the present passage. H. writes: 'Ψοφοδεής was the title of one of Menander's plays, from which, I suspect, was borrowed a detail in *A. P.* 11. 210 ἄνθρακα καὶ δάφνην παραβύεται ὁ στρατιώτης | Αὖλος ἀποσφίγξας μήλινα λώματια (schol. ψοφοδεὴς στρατιώτης. μηδὲ ψόφον τῆς δάφνης φέρειν δυνάμενος), "stuffs his ears against the crackling of cinders and of laurel in the fire with the fringe of his military woollen cloak." Cf. Hesych. μενέκτυπος· ὁ μὴ ψοφοδεής. Eur. *Hec.* 1113 φόβον παρέσχ' ἂν οὐ μέσως ὅδε κτύπος. *Rhes.* 565 ΟΔ. Διόμηδες, οὐκ ἤκουσας—ἢ κενὸς ψόφος | στάζει δι' ὤτων;—τευχέων τινὰ κτύπον; ΔΙ. οὔκ, ἀλλὰ δεσμὰ πωλικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων | κλάζει σιδήρου· κἀμέ τοι, πρὶν ἡσθόμην | δεσμῶν ἀραγμὸν ἱππικῶν, ἔδυ φόβος. In Aesch. *Theb.* 97—100 the panic-stricken maidens are made by the MSS to cry ἀκούετ' ἢ οὐκ ἀκούετ' ἀσπίδων κτύπον;...κτύπον δέδορκα· πάταγος οὐχ ἑνὸς δορός, and δέδορκα was accepted by Jebb on *O. T.* 186, *Phil.* 215; but we must surely read δέδοικα: cf. 235, 185, *Agam.* 1535, Soph. *O. C.* 1462 κτύπος, ἴδε, μάλ' ὅδ' ἐρείπεται | διόβολος ἄφατος (so I read: μέγας is a gloss, as may be seen from Suid. *s.v.* ἄφατος)·...δέδοικα δ'· οὐ γὰρ ἅλιον...Dr Verrall, comparing *Rhes.* 784 χειρὶ σὺν κενῇ δορός, conjectures in *Theb.* 100 πάταγος οὐ κενὸς δορός, which is very probable in my opinion, except that I would rather punctuate κτύπον δέδοικα—πάταγος οὐ κενός—δορός. Similarly in Eur. *Suppl.* 179 Tyrwhitt corrected δεδορκέναι for δεδοικέναι of the MSS. In an epigram quoted by Meineke *Anal. Alex.* p. 397 read τίμα τὸν στέργοντα, παλίστροφα δ' ἔργα δεδοικὼς (for δεδορκώς) | πειράθητι φρονεῖν μηδὲν ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον.'

62

ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἕρπει ψεῦδος εἰς γῆρας χρόνου.

62 Stob. *flor.* 12. 2 (III p. 444, 6 Hense) Σοφοῦ Ἀκρισῖ (so S, Σοφ^{κλ}. Ἀκρῖ cod. Voss., Ἀλενάδαις B: the extract is omitted in MA). 'ἀλλ'...χρόνου.'

The sentiment, that falsehood is a sickly growth which soon decays, may be illustrated by Aesch. *Ag.* 625 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῆ καλὰ | ἐς τὸν πολὺν φίλοισι καρπούσθαι χρόνον. Arist. *eth. N.* 1. 8 1098^{b} 11 τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεῖ πάντα συνάδει τὰ ὑπάρχοντα· τῷ δὲ ψευδεῖ ταχὺ διαφωνεῖ τἀληθές. Theophr. fr. 153 W. ἐκ διαβολῆς καὶ φθόνου ψεῦδος ἐπ' ὀλίγον ἰσχῦσαν ἀπεμαράνθη. Menand. *monost.* 547 ψευδόμενος οὐδεὶς λανθάνει πολὺν χρόνον. Similarly χρόνος δείκνυσιν ἄνδρα (*O. T.* 614 etc.). Nauck, objecting to the phrase γῆρας χρόνου in this connexion, altered γῆρας to μῆκος. This is an arbitrary proceeding, which destroys a characteristic subtlety of diction. Tr.: 'no falsehood lasts through time's decay.' γῆρας χρόνου follows Aesch. *Prom.* 1013 ἀλλ' ἐκδιδάσκει πάνθ' ὁ γηράσκων χρόνος, *Eum.* 286 χρόνος καθαιρεῖ πάντα γηράσκων ὁμοῦ. F. W. Schmidt added Tr. fr. adesp. 508 μετὰ τὴν σκιὰν τάχιστα γηράσκει χρόνος, and Lucian *amor.* 12 οὐδ' αὐτὰ γέροντος ἥδη χρόνου πολιὰ καθηύαινεν. It might be thought that γῆρας should be attributed to ψεῦδος, and that χρόνου could be spared. But the omission would suggest the meaning that falsehood is ever young: cf. *O. C.* 954 θυμοῦ γὰρ οὐδὲν γῆρᾳς ἐστιν ἄλλο πλὴν | θανεῖν, Aesch. *Theb.* 669 οὐκ ἔστι γῆρας τοῦδε τοῦ μιάσματος. For γηράσκειν as implying decay see Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 1223.

63

δῆλον γάρ· ἐν δεσμοῖσι δραπέτης ἀνὴρ
κῶλον ποδισθεὶς πᾶν πρὸς ἡδονὴν λέγει.

63 Stob. *flor.* 62. 30 (IV p. 427, 10 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀκρισίῳ. 'δῆλον... λέγει.'

The situation supposed, that of a runaway slave who having been caught says all he can to win favour, is exactly reproduced in Eur. *Or.* 1498 ff. in the case of Orestes and the Phrygian, who says of himself δραπέτην γὰρ ἐξέκλεπτον ἐκ δόμων πόδα. Orestes taunts him (1514) δειλίᾳ γλώσσῃ χαρίζῃ, τἄνδον οὐχ οὕτω φρονῶν, and threatens him (1516) ὄμοσον, εἰ δὲ μή, κτενῶ σε, μὴ λέγειν ἐμὴν χάριν.

1 I have followed Nauck in putting a colon after **δῆλον γάρ**: the asyndeton in the explanatory clause is usual, as with δῆλον δέ, σημεῖον δέ, and the like (Kuehner-Gerth, § 469, 1). Grotius altered δῆλον to δοῦλον, and was followed by Brunck and Dindorf. H. points out that the order of the words is against taking δῆλον as a grammatical qualification of the clause ἐν...λέγει, as if it were an adverb or a parenthetical adjunct (*scil.* ἐστίν). He quotes *Ai.* 906 αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ, δῆλον, fr. 585 ἀλγεινά, Πρόκνη, δῆλον. So some take *O. C.* 321 μόνης τόδ' ἐστὶ δῆλον Ἰσμήνης κάρα. Add Theocr. 10. 13 ἐκ πίθω ἀντλεῖς δῆλον. But, so used, δῆλον could not stand at the beginning of the sentence.

2 **πρὸς ἡδονήν** means the same as πρὸς χάριν (cf. χαριτογλωσσεῖν) with which it is interchangeable: see Dem. 4. 38, 51. Cf. *El.* 931 οὐ πρὸς ἡδονὴν λέγω τάδε; Eur. *Med.* 773 δέχου δὲ μὴ πρὸς ἡδονὴν λόγους, fr. 28 (n.). Blaydes needlessly conjectured κῶλ' ἐμποδισθείς: cf. *O. C.* 183.

64

ῥῆσις βραχεῖα τοῖς φρονοῦσι σώφρονα
πρὸς τοὺς τεκόντας καὶ φυτεύσαντας πρέπει,
ἄλλως τε καὶ κόρῃ τε κἀργείᾳ γένος.

64. **3** κόρῃ...κἀργείᾳ Meineke: κόρη...καργεία codd.

64 Stob. *flor.* 79. 24 (IV p. 623, 17 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀκρισίῳ. 'ῥῆσις... πρέπει.' Stob. *flor.* 74. 28 (IV p. 579, 10 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ. 'ἄλλως...ἔπη.' S omits the latter extract. Meineke joined vv. 1, 2 to vv. 3, 4, the two couplets being separate extracts in Stobaeus; and they fit together so exactly that his conjecture has a high degree of probability.

1 **βραχεῖα.** F. W. Schmidt, comparing Eur. *Phoen.* 452 f., needlessly proposed βραδεῖα; for the verses are more likely to belong to a speech of Danae to Acrisius, than to a rebuke addressed to her by her father. **τοῖς φρονοῦσι σώφρονα.** For the order of the words cf. *O. T.* 139, *El.* 792, *Ai.* 635, 1252, *Ant.* 723, with Jebb's notes.

2 **τεκόντας καὶ φυτεύσαντας** is tautologous, but intended to emphasize the tie of relationship. So *El.* 12 πρὸς σῆς ὁμαίμου καὶ κασιγνήτης, Aesch. *Cho.* 328 πατέρων τε καὶ τεκόντων, Eur. *Her.* 1367 ὁ φύσας χὠ τεκὼν ὑμᾶς πατήρ, *Suppl.* 1092 ὅστις φυτεύσας καὶ τεκὼν νεανίαν, *Hec.* 414 ὦ μῆτερ, ὦ τεκοῦσ'. It is unnecessary to suspect the text, as some critics have done: see Nauck. Mekler conj. τοὺς τεκόντας καὶ λοχεύσαντας, comparing Eur. *El.* 1129.

3 **ἄλλως τε καί** occurs also in *El.* 1324 and ἄλλως τε in *O. T.* 1114. Aeschylus uses ἄλλως τε πάντως καί in *Eum.* 729, *Pers.* 691, *Prom.* 662 f. σὸν ἔργον, Ἰοί, ταῖσδ' ὑπουργῆσαι χάριν | ἄλλως τε πάντως καὶ κασιγνήταις πατρός. **κἀργείᾳ.** βραχυλογία was characteristic of the Dorians, of the Argives as well as the Spartans: cf. Pind. *Isth.* 5. 58 τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον | εἰρήσεταί πᾷ κ' ἐν βραχύστοις, Aesch. *Suppl.* 279 μακράν γε μὲν δὴ

αἷς κόσμος ἡ σιγή τε καὶ τὰ παῦρ' ἔπη.

4 ἡ σιγή τε] σεσίγηται M et primitus A

ῥῆσιν οὐ στέργει πόλις, *ib.* 206 f., Soph. fr. 462.—**γένος**: for the acc. of respect see Jebb on *Phil.* 239.

4 κόσμος: cf. *Ai.* 293 γυναιξὶ κόσμον ἡ σιγὴ φέρει. In this and similar phrases the idea of *personal ornament* seems to be conveyed (fr. 846); one suspects that σιγὴ κόσμος, *silence a jewel*, was almost proverbial: cf. Eur. fr. 219 κόσμος δὲ σιγὴ στέφανος (στεγανὸς Herw.) ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ, Bacchyl. 3. 94 πράξαντι δ' εὖ οὐ φέρει κόσμον σιωπά.—**αἷς**. For the plural see on Eur. *Hel.* 440 and add Plat. *rep.* 554 A θησαυροποιὸς ἀνὴρ· οὗς κτέ. H., who thinks that the speaker is Acrisius, renders:

Short speech for those of proper modesty
Is seemly toward the parents that begat them;
The more so for a girl and Argive born,
Whose ornament is silence and few words.

65

θάρσει, γύναι· τὰ πολλὰ τῶν δεινῶν, ὄναρ
πνεύσαντα νυκτός, ἡμέρας μαλάσσεται.

65 Stob. *flor.* 108. 56 (IV p. 971, 13 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀκρισίῳ (so MA: S omits the name of the play). '*θάρσει... μαλάσσεται.*'

(1) The metaphor is generally taken, as by Ellendt and Campbell, to be that of a gale which blows for a time and then subsides. A simile will be required in English: 'most of the terrors that come in dreams are like a wind that blows by night and sinks in the day-time.' Thus πνεῖν used metaphorically would connote a certain degree of vigour or violence as in Ar. *Eq.* 437 οὗτος ἤδη καικίας ἡ συκοφαντίας πνεῖ, and would be contrasted with μαλάσσεται. Phot. *lex.* p. 321, 23 πνεύσας· σφοδρῶς ὀργισθείς. Suid. *s.v.* Hesych. III p. 348 πνεύσας· ὀργισθείς, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἀνέμων. (2) But the association of πνεῖν with dreams in *El.* 480 ἀδυπνόων κλύουσαν | ἀρτίως ὀνειράτων and in Aesch. *Cho.* 33 τορὸς γὰρ ὀρθόθριξ φόβος | δόμων ὀνειρόμαντις ἐξ ὕπνου κότον | πνέων ἀωρόνυκτον ἀμβόαμα, where the language has several points of similarity, makes this explanation doubtful. Kaibel (on *El.* l.c.) suggests that the metaphor is taken from the breath of the voice: a dream is a message heard. It should be added that μαλάσσεται is not an apt word in relation to a gale; its usual application is rather to express the assuagement of an emotion. Anyhow, there is no occasion for Blaydes's φανέντα (for πνεύσαντα).—The daylight was believed to be effective in purging the evil influence of dreams: Eur. *I. T.* 42 ἃ καινὰ δ' ἥκει νὺξ φέρουσα φάσματα, | λέξω πρὸς αἰθέρ', εἴ τι δὴ τόδ' ἔστ' ἄκος.

Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.*, p. 55, refers this fragment to a significant dream of Danae or her mother, and compares Naevius *Danae* fr. V *amnis niveo fonte lavere me memini manum*, where he finds an allusion to a dream.

66

τοῦ ζῆν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὡς ὁ γηράσκων ἐρᾷ.

66 Stob. *flor.* 119. 7 (IV p. 1076, 3 Hense) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Σοφοκλέους) Ἀκρισίῳ. '*τοῦ...ἐρᾷ.*' In Stob. *flor.* 115. 9 (IV p. 1022, 8 Hense) the line is attached to a passage from a comic poet (Antiphanes fr. 238 II 116 K.), and appears again in Stob. *flor.* 116. 39 (IV p. 1046, 7 Hense) Σοφοκλέους. '*ζῆν... ἐρᾷ.*'

For the sentiment see on fr. 298.—**οὐδεὶς ὡς**, 'none *so much* as,' is like οὐδὲν οἷον, for which see on fr. 556. The converse ὡς οὐδείς, 'more than any,' occurs in Plat. *apol.* 35 D. Cf. Eur. fr. 320 οὐκ ἔστιν...δυσφύλακτον οὐδὲν ὡς γυνή. Aesch. *Cho.* 848 οὐδὲν ἀγγέλων σθένος | ὡς αὐτός.

67

τὸ ζῆν γάρ, ὦ παῖ, παντὸς ἥδιον γέρας·
θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔξεστι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δίς.

67. 1 ἥδιον Meineke: ἥδιστον codd.

67 Stob. *flor.* 119. 12 (IV p. 1074, 12 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀκρισίου (so A: om. S). '*τὸ ζῆν...δίς.*'

No man can die twice; and that makes life all the sweeter, as an experience that can never be repeated. The second line is a variation of the saw often remodelled after Hom. I 408 *ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λητὸς | οὔθ' ἑλετή, ἐπεὶ ἆρ κεν ἀμείψῃ ἕρκος ὀδόντων.* Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 651 *ἅπαξ θανόντος οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις.* Eur. *Her.* 297. *Alc.* 1076. *Suppl.* 775 etc.

1 ἥδιον. I have accepted Meineke's correction: for the common confusion of comparative and superlative terminations see Cobet, *N. L.* p. 119. *παντὸς ἥδιστον* cannot be defended either by the anomalies, mostly corrupt, collected in Kuehner-Gerth I 22 f., or by *παντὸς μάλιστα* quoted by Stephanus from Dion. Hal. *ant. Rom.* 1. 24, 2. 75, 3. 35 and other passages, where it takes the place of the Platonic *παντὸς μᾶλλον*. Blaydes preferred *πᾶσιν* (or *που 'στιν*) *ἥδιστον*.

68

Ἀκτίτης λίθος

68 Hesych. I p. 110 *ἀκτίτης* (*ἀκτήτις* cod.: corr. Musurus) *λίθος· ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἀκτῆς.* Σοφοκλῆς *Ἀκρισίῳ*. Cf. Harpocr. p. 10, 4 *Ἀκτὴ ἐπιθαλαττιδιός τις μοῖρα τῆς Ἀττικῆς· Ὑπερίδης ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ παρίχους· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ ἀκτίτης λίθος.* To the same effect, but without the reference to Hyperides, Bekk. *anecd.* p. 370, 9, Suid. *s.v.*

Ἀκτίτης λίθος was the name given to the limestone taken from the quarries worked at Acte, the peninsula to the S. of the Peiraeus and lying between it and the bay of Phalerum. Cf. *CIA* II 1054, 16 *οἰκοδομήσει δὲ τοῖς τοίχοις τῆς σκευοθήκης καὶ τοῖν αἴοναι Ἀκτίτου λίθου.* See Dittenberger's note (*Syll.*[3] 537, 17). Hesych. I p. 108 explains *ἀκταία*, supposed to be a kind of mortar, as *ἡ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀκτίτου λίθου κατασκευασθεῖσα, τοῦ Πεντελικοῦ (? Πειραικοῦ)*. In Tr. fr. adesp. 467 from Steph. Byz. p. 64, 15 *Ἀκτίτης, ἐξ οὗ τὸ "Ἀκτίτου πέτρα" ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ* Nauck is probably right in restoring *Ἀκτίτης πέτρα*. The scene of the *Acrisius* was laid at Argos, and this fact confirms the statement of Hesychius that Sophocles referred to the Peloponnesian Acte; for this was also the name given to the east coast of Argolis between Troezen and Epidaurus. The alternative is to suppose that he was alluding to stone imported from Attica, and that Hesych. is mistaken. For the form *ἀκτίτης*, which would properly be applied to an inhabitant of Acte, see on fr. 92.

69

Μαριεὺς ἁλοιμός

69 *Etym. M.* p. 69, 42 *ἁλοιμός· τὰς χρύσεις καὶ τὰς ἐπαλείψεις ἁλοιμοὺς ἔλεγον.* Σοφοκλῆς *'Μαριεὺς ἁλοιμός' ἡ ἐπάνω τῆς τοῦ θαλάμου γανώσεως ἐπισεισα ἐπάλειψις, καθαπερανεί πεταλωτὶς οὖσα ἐν αὐτῷ.* The information is attributed to Orus, a grammarian of uncertain date (Sandys, *Hist. Cl. Scholarship* I p. 325). Hesych. I p. 130 *ἁλοιμός* (*ἅλοιμα* cod.)*· χρίσμα τοίχων.* Σοφοκλῆς *Ἀκρισίῳ*. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 384, 9 *ἁλοιμός· τὸ τῶν τοίχων χρίσμα.*

The reference is to a method of wall-

decoration by a process of polishing or varnishing, which was connected with the name of the Cyprian town of Marion, afterwards known as Arsinoe. It was situated on the N. coast of the island between the promontory Acamas and the town of Soli (Strabo 683). The site is described by Munro and Tubbs in *J. H. S.* XI 1 ff. Orus explained the process by comparing it to *πετάλωσις*, *i.e.* the laying-on of gold-leaf. See Plato's description of the walls of Atlantis: *Criti.* 116 B *καὶ τοῦ μὲν περὶ τὸν ἐξωτάτω τροχὸν τείχους χαλκῷ περιελάμβανον πάντα τὸν περίδρομον, οἷον ἀλοιφῇ προσχρώμενοι· ibid.* D *πάντα δὲ ἔξωθεν περιήλειψαν τὸν νεὼν ἀργύρῳ κτέ.* No doubt such ornamentation was associated by the Greeks with the art of the heroic age, rightly enough as recent discoveries have proved: see Jebb, *Introduction to Homer*, p. 61. [Arist.] *mir. ausc.* 41 mentions a stone called *μαριεύς*, which takes fire when water is poured on it. But in Hesych. III p. 72 this is named *μαριζεύς*, and not contrary to the alphabetical order, as L. and S. state.

70

ἰλλάδας γονάς

70 Hesych. II p. 356 *ἰλλάδας γονάς· ἀγελαίας* (so Musurus for *ἀγελειάς* cod.) *καὶ τὰς συστροφάς. Εὐριπίδης Φρίξῳ* (fr. 837) *καὶ Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ.*

ἰλλάδας γονάς, 'herding produce.' The adj. is aptly used of the cattle *crowding* or *pressing together*, as they are driven. Cf. Hom. Θ 215. I have very little doubt that this was Hesychius' explanation, and that we ought to read *ἀγελαίας κατὰ τὰς συστροφάς.* For *συστρέφειν*, *συστροφή* are regularly used by the lexicographers in glossing *ἴλλειν* (*εἰλλειν*) and *ἴλη*: schol. Ar. *Ran.* 1066 *περιλλόμενος*] *ἀντὶ τοῦ περιειληθεὶς ἢ συστραφείς. ἰλλειν γὰρ τὸ συστρέφειν.* Suid. *s.v.* *ἴλας. ἀγέλας ἢ τάξεις...ἴλη γὰρ συστροφή.* id. *s.v.* *εἰλαδόν. κατὰ συστροφήν* (so Hesych.). *s.v.* *εἰληδόν. συνεστραμμένως.* Hesych. II p. 28 *εἴλην· συστροφήν, πλῆθος.* p. 29 *εἰλομένων· συστρεφομένων ἐν πολέμῳ.* p. 356 *ἴλλαι· τάξεις. συστροφαί. Etym. M.* p. 361, 44 explains the Homeric *ἰλλάδες* (N 572) as *οἱ συνεστραμμένοι ἱμάντες.* It appears, then, that L. Dindorf (*Thes.* II p. 711) should not have deleted the words *καὶ τὰς συστροφάς.* He went on to explain *ἰλλάδες γοναί* as referring to plough-oxen, comparing *Ant.* 341 *ἰλλομένων ἀρότρων.* I presume he took *ἰλλάδες* as='turning to and fro,' but this is hardly conceivable without the addition of (*e.g.*) *ἀρότροις.* For the meaning of *ἰλλειν* Buttmann's article (*Lexil.* § 44) is still worth reading.—For the concrete use of *γονάς* cf. Aesch. fr. 194 *ἵππων ὄνων τ' ὀχεῖα καὶ ταύρων γονάς.* Here the adj. takes the place of a genitive (*ἀγελῶν*), as in *Ai.* 71 *αἰχμαλωτίδας χέρας* (Jebb).

71

ἄδοξα

71 Hesych. I p. 47 *ἄδοξα· παράδοξα καὶ <ἃ> οὐκ ἄν τις ἐδόξασεν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ* (*ἄκρισιν* cod.). Phot. ed. Reitz, p. 33, 7 (Bekk. *anecd.* p. 344, 27) *ἄδοξα· τὰ παράδοξα, ἃ οὐκ ἄν τις δοξάσειεν.* (=Phryn. fr. 79 de B.) In the same sense Sophocles employs also *ἀδόκητος, ἀδόξαστος* (fr. 223), *ἄελπτος, ἀνέλπιστος.* In spite of its rarity, *ἄδοξος* must have been well-established as='improbable'; for it is so used several times by Aristotle in the *topica*: see (*e.g.*) 9. 12. 173ª 26 *τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς ἄδοξον τὸ βασιλέα μὴ εὐδαιμονεῖν.*

72

ἀνταίαν

72 Hesych. I p. 209 *ἀνταίαν· ἔκτοπον, χαλεπήν. Σοφοκλῆς τισίῳ* (Musurus restored *Ἀκρισίῳ*). The meaning of *ἀνταῖος* is discussed on fr. 334. *ἔκτοπον* means 'strange,' in the sense of 'startling.' Hesych. II p. 54 *ἔκτοπον· χαλεπόν. ξένον.*

73

ἀπόδρομον

73 Hesych. ι p. 245 ἀπόδρομον· ἐλαττούμενον τοῖς δρόμοις. ἢ παλίνδρομον. ἢ μετ' ἐπάνοδον. ἀκρησίῳ (Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ Musurus). This is extremely obscure, and Ellendt corrects μετ' ἐπανόδου, with the intention, I suppose, of accommodating it to παλίνδρομον. Our only other authority for ἀπόδρομος is to be found in certain passages of Eustathius (*Il.* p. 727, 21, *Od.* p. 1592, 56, p. 1788, 56). Eustathius takes his information in part from Alexion, a grammarian in the latter half of the first century A.D., who drew from the best Alexandrian sources. According to Eustathius ἀπόδρομος was used in two senses: (1) ὡς ἤδη πεπαυμένον ἀπὸ τῶν δρόμων. This use is ascribed to 'certain of the ancients' on the analogy of ἀπόμαχος. (2) As a name given to the ἔφηβοι by the Cretans, διὰ τὸ μηδέπω τῶν κοινῶν δρόμων μετέχειν. It may here be mentioned that M. Schmidt thought ἀκρησίῳ in Hesych. was an error for παρὰ Κρησί. He does not quote Eustathius; nor would Eustath. throw any light on the obscurity of Hesych., even if Schmidt's conjecture were right. It is perhaps more probable that Soph. used the word in the former of the two senses recorded by Eustath.; and Hesych.'s ἐλαττούμενον τοῖς δρόμοις may refer to one who was too weak to compete in a race. We can hardly go further, but the alternatives lead me to suspect that ἀπόδρομος was employed metaphorically. Hartung quite unjustifiably interprets 'a runaway slave,' and compares fr. 63.

74

ἀποφανθείς

74 Hesych. ι p. 262 ἀποφανθείς· ἐν τῷ φανερῷ καταστάς. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ. Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 352 ἀποφαίνουσι τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ λύκοι ἐξαφίνης ἐγένοντο, and see fr. 1023.

75

ἀρώματα

75 Hesych. ι p. 295 ἀρώματα (ἀρόματα cod., against the order of letters: corr. Voss)· ἀροτριάματα (or perh. rather ἀροτριώματα, as M. Schmidt conjectured). καὶ ἀπὸ (ἐπὶ cod.: corr. Heinsius) τοῦ ἀρόειν τὰ ἅλφιτα οὕτω λέγεται. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ (Ἀκρισι cod.: corr. Musurus). The inference to be drawn from this is that Sophocles used ἀρώματα in the sense of *arable land*, not for ἅλφιτα which would hardly be credible. Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1158 εὖ ποιοῦντος κὠφελοῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ τἀρώματα, where the schol. makes it plain that the mention of ἅλφιτα in Hesych. actually refers to a passage of Eupolis: τὰ ἀροτριάματα, παρὰ τὸ ἀροτριᾶν. τὰ προηροτριωμένα. Λέγουσι δὲ ἔνιοι καὶ τὰ ἅλφιτα καὶ τὸν λιβανωτὸν ἀρώματα, ὡς παρ' Εὐπόλιδι (fr. 304 I 336 K.) 'καὶ σίνδι τῶν ἀρωμάτων,' ἀντὶ τοῦ των ἀλφίτων. The word is entirely distinct from ἀρώματα = ἐπιθυμιάματα (Apoll. *lex.* p. 41. 29): hence Bekk. *anecd.* p. 450, 13 ἀρώματα οὐ τὰ θυμιάματα οἱ Ἀττικοί καλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐσπαρμένα. With Eupolis we are not concerned, but it might be thought that *εταρι* rather than *tilia* is the meaning to be inferred for Sophocles. That this is not the case is shown by Lucian *Lexiph.* 2 ἐγὼ δὲ περιελθὼν τὰ ἀρώματα, σκόροδά τε εὗρον ἐν αὐτοῖς πεφυκότα, where the schol. has ἀρώματα δὲ τὰ ἀρότρῳ ἐξειργασμένα πεδία, Aelian *n. a.* 7. 8 ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ἀρώμασι φαινόμεναι, 16. 14 ἐν ταῖς βαθείαις ἀρώμασιν. For the late form ἄρωμα, which is to be rejected, see Cobet, *V. L.* p. 83. The spread of the short penultimate in late Greek is illustrated from the papyri by J. H. Moulton in *C. R.* XVIII 168.

76

ἄστομος

76 Hesych. 1 p. 306 *ἄστομος· ὁ μὴ δυνάμενος λέγειν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀκρισίῳ.* *ἄστομος*, elsewhere of a *hard-mouthed* horse (*El.* 724), is here a synonym of *ἄνανδος, ἄφθογγος, ἄφωνος, ἀψόφητος* etc. This is possible because *στόμα* had become familiar in the sense of 'speech': *σοῦ γ' εἰς τόδ' ἐξελθόντος ἀνόσιον στόμα* *O. C.* 981. In Strabo 70 *οἱ τοὺς ἀστόμους τε καὶ ἄρρινας ἱστοροῦντες* and in Lucian *Lexiph.* 15 *ἀλογίαν ἡμῖν ἐπιτάττεις ὡς ἀστόμοις οὖσι καὶ ἀπεγγλωττισμένοις* the meaning is different, 'without a mouth.' But cf. Epict. *diss.* 2. 24. 26, Achilles reduces Odysseus and Phoenix to silence (*ἀστόμους πεποίηκε*).

ΑΛΕΑΔΑΙ

The mistaken correction of the title to *Ἀλῶαδαι* was due to Hemsterhuis on Lucian *Charon* 3 p. 494, and was supported by an explanation of fr. 89 from Apollod. 1. 55, where Artemis takes the form of a stag, and by a stratagem induces Otus and Ephialtes to shoot each other. But *ἔκηλος* is inconsistent with this view.

Subsequent investigation has decisively shown that the subject of the play was the fortunes of Auge and her son Telephus, and the credit of establishing the truth belongs to Fr. Vater, who in his dissertation *die Aleaden des Sophokles*, Berlin, 1835, first pointed out the significance for the present purpose of a passage in one of the declamations attributed to Alcidamas (*Odyss.* 13—16, p. 187 Bl.²). It is there related how Aleos, king of Tegea, went to Delphi and received an oracle from the god, warning him that, if his daughter bore a son, his own sons must die by the hand of his grandson. Accordingly, on his return home, Aleos made his daughter Auge priestess of Athena, vowing that he would kill her if she ever became a wife. It so happened that Heracles came to Tegea, when on his way to Elis to attack Augeas, and was entertained by Aleos in the temple of Athena. Heracles saw the girl, met her in secret, and left her pregnant. When Aleos discovered the state of affairs, he sent for Nauplius, king of Euboea, and handed over Auge to him, with directions that she should be drowned[1]. However, on the journey from Tegea, Auge gave birth to Telephus on Mt Parthenius; and Nauplius, disregarding his instructions, sold mother and child to be conveyed across the sea to King Teuthras in Mysia. Teuthras, who was childless, married Auge, and adopted her son, to whom he gave the name

[1] Cf. the similar story of Aerope, related in the *Κρῆσσαι* of Euripides: schol. *Ai.* 1295, Apollod. 3. 15.

Telephus. The story was current in several versions, but the importance of the account preserved by Alcidamas is that he alone refers to the oracle given to Aleos, and mentions this as the reason why Auge was entrusted to Nauplius. This at once explains the title of Sophocles' play. Confirmation of Alcidamas is to be found in *Proverb. Append.* 2. 87 (*Paroem.* I 412) as well as in Hygin. *fab.* 244 *Telephus Herculis filius Hippothoum et Neaerae aviae suae filios* (sc. *occidit*)[1]. It will be seen that the name of the other son is lost, and Hippothous is nowhere else mentioned as a son of Aleos. Apollod. 3. 102 calls the sons of Aleos and Neaera by the names Cepheus and Lycurgus, whereas Pausan. 8. 4. 8 and Ap. Rhod. 1. 161 ff. make them three in number, Lycurgus, Cepheus, and Amphidamas.

As contrasted with the account of Alcidamas, that of Apollodorus (2. 146) mentions temple-defilement and consequent λοιμός (or λιμός, as in 3. 103) as the causes which induced Aleos to hand over Auge to Nauplius and to expose her child. Diodorus, however, whose version is more rationalistic, simply relates (4. 33) that Aleos discovered his daughter to be pregnant, and sent her away in disgrace, not believing her story that she was with child by Heracles. In regard to the circumstances of the birth of Telephus, Sophocles and Alcidamas followed different versions; for the latter allows no place for the suckling of the infant by a hind, which is clearly referred to in fr. 89. Here, therefore, the Sophoclean plot approximated to the story as related in Diodorus, Apollod. *ll. cc.*, Pausan. 8. 48. 7, 54. 6[2]. It is reasonable to infer that, according to Sophocles, Telephus was reared by the herdsmen of King Corythus[3], or by Corythus himself; and that the question of his birth in some way or other presented itself to him, when he was grown to manhood. According to Apollod. 3. 104 and Diod. *l.c.* he went to Delphi to enquire of the oracle, and was sent by the god to Mysia. It will be observed that the above-mentioned authorities do not give any information concerning the return of Telephus to the palace of Aleos, or the manner in which he killed his uncles. The gap can only be filled by conjecture, and there is nothing to help us except that frs. 86, 87 appear to belong to a scene in which a question of doubtful birth was canvassed. Wernicke (in Pauly-Wissowa II 2302) inferred that Telephus was mocked by

[1] The text is corrupt, but M. Schmidt is doubtless right in restoring *Neaerae* for *Nerei* from *ib.* 243 *Neaera Auto'yci filia propter Hippothoi filii mortem* (sc. *a qua interfecti*). Robert however prefers (*Arch. Jahrb.* III 61) to read *Perei* for *Nerei* and *Hippothoi et. filiorum* in 243.

[2] The incident was hardly a late invention, as Jahn supposed: Frazer, *Pausan.* IV p. 437.

[3] The eponym of the Κορυθεῖς in Arcadia (Pausan. 8. 45. 1; 54. 5).

Hippothous and his brother for the obscurity of his origin, and that he slew them in anger; that subsequently Aleos demanded his surrender from Corythus; that in consequence of the explanation given he recognized his grandson; and that he then required him to consult the oracle in order to learn how he should expiate his blood-guilt. Robert (*Arch. Jahrb.* III 61 ff.) thinks it more likely that the strife between Telephus and the Aleadae arose out of some incident similar to the Calydonian hunt in the legend of Meleager. He points out that in that case fr. 84 suitably describes the overthrow of two princes of the royal house by a foreign bastard. This carries the story to the period which is covered by the action of the *Mysians*. Welcker (p. 413) preferred to suppose that Heracles appeared as *deus ex machina* to clear up the dispute, and ordered Telephus to go to Mysia[1].

It should be observed that an entirely different version of the story was adopted by Euripides, to the effect that mother and child were cast adrift together in a chest by Aleos, but ultimately reached the mouth of the Caicus, and were rescued by Teuthras (Strabo 615). Such at least was the account given in the prologue to the *Telephus*; for in the later *Auge* Telephus was separated from his mother and exposed (Wilamowitz, *Anal. Eur.* p. 189 f.). The simpler story, which is parallel to that of Danae, was given by Hecataeus (Pausan. 8. 4. 8), and is believed, although the reasons assigned are hardly convincing, to have been derived from the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad* (Wernicke, *u.s.* 2300). The Pergamene dynasty established by Attalus traced their descent from Telephus, and the people claimed to be Arcadians sprung from the band which crossed with Telephus to Asia. Thus they were precluded from giving official recognition to the λάρναξ-story, and followed in preference, as has been shown exhaustively by Robert (*Arch. Jahrb.* II 244, III 45, 87), the versions of Aeschylus and Sophocles. See also Frazer, *Pausan.* II p. 76.

77

ἐνταῦθα μέντοι πάντα τἀνθρώπων νοσεῖ,
κακοῖς ὅταν θελωσιν ἰᾶσθαι κακά.

77 Stob. *flor.* 4. 37 (III p. 228, 17 Hense) Σοφοκλέους. 'ἐνταῦθα...κακά.' The extract is omitted in SMA, ed. Trinc. gives as above, and 'Αλεάδαις is added after Σοφοκλέους by two of Schow's MSS known as B, C. For these see Hense in *Rh. Mus.* XLI 59 f.

1 ἐνταῦθα looks forward to the following clause: cf. Eur. fr. 497 καὶ γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν νοσεῖ | τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν· οἱ μὲν κτέ.

[1] So also Fr. Vater, *op. cit.* p. 25.

Her. 306 ἐν τῷδε γὰρ κάμνουσιν αἱ πολλαὶ πόλεις, | ὅταν τις κτέ. *Hel.* 581 ἐκεῖ νοσοῦμεν, ὅτι δάμαρτ' ἄλλην ἔχω. *I.T.* 1018 τῇδε γὰρ νοσεῖ | νόστος πρὸς οἴκους looks backward. For the use of ὅταν see *A.J.P.* XXXIII 428.

2 κακοῖς κτέ. For the proverb κακὸν κακῷ ἰᾶσθαι cf. Aesch. fr. 349 μὴ κακοῖς ἰῶ κακά. Soph. fr. 589, *Ai.* 362 μὴ κακὸν κακῷ διδοὺς | ἄκος πλέον τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης τίθει, where Jebb gives other illustrations. See also on fr. 854. Plut. *de garrul.* 4 p. 504 B ἔστι δὲ θεραπεύων τῆς νόσου βαρύτερος (*sc.* ὁ ἀδόλεσχος), where the doctor himself rather than his drugs is at fault. Similarly Eur. *Bacch.* 839 κακοῖς θηρᾶν κακά, Aelian *nat. an.* 3. 47 (of Oedipus) μὴ τῷ οἴκῳ καὶ τῷ γένει καταρώμενον εἶτα μέντοι κακῷ ἀνηκέστῳ ἰᾶσθαι κακὰ τὰ ἤδη παρελθόντα.

78

τοῖς γὰρ δικαίοις ἀντέχειν οὐ ῥᾴδιον.

78 Stob. *flor.* 9. 4 (III p. 346, 14 Hense) Σοφοκλέους (Εὐριπίδου A) Ἀλεάδαι (ἀλαιάδαι M, ἀλωάδαι A). 'τοῖς... ῥᾴδιον.'

This is the converse of our proverb 'Might is Right.' Cf. *O.C.* 880 τοῖς τοι δικαίοις χὠ βραχὺς νικᾷ μέγαν. Eur. *Suppl.* 437 νικᾷ δ' ὁ μείων τὸν μέγαν δίκαι' ἔχων. Eur. fr. 584 εἰς τοι δίκαιοι μυρίων οὐκ ἐνδίκων | κρατεῖ, τὸ θεῖον τὴν δίκην τε συλλαβών. These are variations of the simple theme in Eur. fr. 343 θάρσει· τό τοι δίκαιον ἰσχύει μέγα. See also fr. 80.

79

κακὸν τὸ κεύθειν κοὐ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς εὐγενοῦς.

79 κού Gesner: καὶ S

79 Stob. *flor.* 12. 3 (III p. 444, 8 Hense) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Σοφοκλέους) Ἀλεάδ. 'κακὸν εὐγενοῦς.' The extract is contained in S only of Hense's MSS.

κεύθειν, *i.e.* to hide one's true thought. Cf. Hom. I 312 ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν, | ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ. Pseudo-Phocylides 48 μηδ' ἕτερον κεύθοις κραδίῃ νόον, ἄλλ' ἀγορεύων. Sall. *Cat.* 10. For the absolute use of κεύθειν in the transitive sense cf. *Trach.* 988, Aesch. *Cho.* 101 μὴ κεύθετ' ἔνδον καρδίας φόβῳ τινός, 'don't practise concealment.' Herwerden conj. κλέπτειν. With the addition, *noblesse oblige*, cf. Chaeremon fr. 27 (*TGF* p. 789) ψευδῆ δὲ τοῖς ἐσθλοῖσιν οὐ πρέπει λέγειν.—**πρός**: 'befitting' (proceeding from). For this idiom see my n. on Eur. *Hel.* 950 and Blaydes on *Ai.* 319. So fr. 319.—For καί and κού confused Campbell refers to *Trach.* 1046.

80

καὶ γὰρ δικαία γλῶσσ' ἔχει κράτος μέγα.

80 Stob. *flor.* 13. 6 (III p. 457, 10 Hense) Σοφοκλέους ἐξ Ἀλεάδων (L has ἐξ Ἀλεαδῶν without the poet's name: Σοφοκλέους Ἀλεάδαι SMA) καὶ γάρ.. μέγα.

For the sentiment see on fr. 78. It is referred to also in *Phil.* 1245 f. σὺ δ' οὔτε φωνεῖς οὔτε δρασείεις σοφά. | ἀλλ' εἰ δικαία, τῶν σοφῶν κρείσσω τάδε.

81

ὦ παῖ, σιώπα· πόλλ' ἔχει σιγὴ καλά.

81 σιγὴ M et Plut. : σιωπὴ S

81 Stob. *flor.* 33. 3 (III p. 678, 10 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀλεάδαις (αἰλέασι M, but S omits the name of the play, and A the whole extract). '*ὦ...καλά.*' Plut. *de garrul.* 2 p. 502 E *εἰπωμεν πρὸς τὸν ἀδόλεσχον 'ὦ...καλά.'* Arsenius p. 737, 9 (=Apostol. XVIII 62 a) assigns the line to Menander, but Dindorf and Hense point out that this is due to the fact that Menander is the author of the verse immediately preceding it in Stobaeus.

The verse is not a general recommendation of silence; and the context would probably have shown that silence was enjoined in painful circumstances, where the truth must be avoided. Such at least was the ordinary man's morality: see Pind. *Nem.* 5. 16 *οὗτοι ἅπασα κερδίων | φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκής· | καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώτατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι*, fr. 180 *ἔσθ' ὅτε πιστοτάτα σιγᾶς ὁδός· κέν|τρον δὲ μάχας ὁ κρατιστεύων λόγος.* Aesch. fr. 188 *πολλοῖς γάρ ἐστι κέρδος ἡ σιγὴ βροτῶν.* *Ag.* 553 *πάλαι τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω* should be compared with Carcin. fr. 7 *πολλῶν γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι φάρμακον κακῶν | σιγή.*—**πολλὰ**...**καλά** in place of the more usual *πολλὰ καὶ καλά*: see Jebb on *Phil.* 583.

82

τί ταῦτα πολλῶν ῥημάτων ἔτ' ἔστι σοι;
τὰ γὰρ περισσὰ πανταχοῦ λυπήρ' ἔπη.

82 Stob. *flor.* 36. 11 (III p. 692, 12 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀλεάδαις. '*τί...ἔπη.*'

1 'Why should this still need many words from you?' Herwerden conjectured *ῥημάτων ἐπαξιοῖς*, but *ἔτι* is indispensable (better *ἔτ' ἀξιοῖς*, as Hense says) and the genitive (descriptive, ='*requiring* many words') is idiomatic: Plat. *Gorg.* 461 A *ταῦτα οὖν ὅτῳ ποτὲ ἔχει, οὐκ ὀλίγης συνουσίας ἐστὶν ὥστε ἱκανῶς διασκέψασθαι.* H. quotes Pind. *Nem.* 10. 46 *μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆσαι σχολᾶς.* Herodian *Philet.* (Pierson's Moeris, p. 475) *ὀλίγης ἐστὶ διδασκαλίας, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ὀλίγων δεῖται πρὸς μάθησιν.* Euenus fr. 1, 5 *τοὺς ξυνετοὺς... οἵπερ καὶ ῥᾴστης εἰσὶ διδασκαλίης.*

2 **περισσὰ** is used as in Aesch. *Theb.* 1034 *περισσὰ κηρύσσειν.* Cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 459 *περισσὰ φωνῶν*, *Med.* 819 *περισσοὶ πάντες οὐν μέσῳ λόγοι.* But in *O. T.* 841 *περισσὸν λόγον* means 'remarkable, of special note.'

83

μὴ πάντ' ἐρεύνα· πολλὰ καὶ λαθεῖν καλόν.

83 λαθεῖν καλόν Blomfield : λαλεῖν κακόν codd.

83 Stob. *flor.* 41. 4 (III p. 758, 5 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀλεάδαις. '*μὴ...καλόν.*'

The verse is a pendant of fr. 81: 'Silence is good, where there is a skeleton in the house.' On the other hand, good fortune should be proclaimed to all. Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 83 *τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω.* fr. 42 *καλῶν μὲν ὧν μοῖραν τε τερ|πνῶν ἐς μέσον χρὴ παντὶ λαῷ | δείκνυναι· εἰ δέ τις ἀνθρώ-| ποισι θεόσδοτος ἀτλάτα κακότας | προστύχῃ, ταύταν σκότει κρύπτειν ἔοικεν*, Eur. fr. 460. See on fr. 64, where the phrase *σιγὴ κόσμος* is discussed: it is worth notice that, in the passages there mentioned, Bacchylides takes the conventional view, whereas Euripides advocated the dignity of silence. Blomfield's correction is strongly supported by Eur. *Hipp.* 465 *ἐν σοφοῖσι γὰρ | τάδ' ἐστὶ θνητῶν, λανθάνειν τὰ μὴ καλά.* Blaydes thought *τοι* preferable to *καὶ*; but see on fr. 23.

84

κοὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι χρὴ πρὸς ταῦτα λέγειν,
ὅταν οἱ γ' ἀγαθοὶ πρὸς τῶν ἀγενῶν
κατανικῶνται.
ποία πόλις ἂν τάδ' ἐνέγκοι;

84. **2** γ' Valckenaer: τ' codd. | ἀγενῶν Grotius: ἀγεννῶν codd.

84 Stob. *flor.* 43. 6 (IV p. 2, 12 Hense) Σοφοκλέους (τοῦ αὐτοῦ S) Ἀλεάδαι. 'κοὐκ... ἐνέγκοι;' Also in *corp. Par.* 716 Elter, with χρὴ omitted in v. 1.

The non-committal punctuationadopted by Dindorf and Nauck, who, keeping τ' in v. 2. print commas after λέγειν and κατανικῶνται, leaves the connexion of the clauses obscure. But τ' does not seem to be in place as a connective, whether or not a heavier stop is placed after λέγειν. I have followed Valckenaer in giving γ' for τ', and in joining the ὅταν clause with the words which precede it. The subordinate clause then conveys a causal implication, as in *Phil.* 451 ποῦ χρὴ τιθεσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν, ὅταν | τὰ θεῖ' ἐπαινῶν τοὺς θεοὺς εὕρω κακούς; For ὅταν so used see my paper in *A.J.P.* XXXIII 426 ff.

The appearance of γε, as after ὁπότε, ὅπου, ἐπειδή, εὖτε and the like, is idiomatic: see Neil's *Equites* p. 190, Kuehner-Gerth § 509. 9 (*c*), and cf. *Ai.* 715, *Phil.* 1099. H. points out that a similar question arises in *Phil.* 456, where γ' is given as a variant for θ' in L and is the reading of several other MSS. But, independently of authority, the case for θ' is strong there. Robert, retaining τ', assumes a lacuna after κατανικῶνται. Hense suggests οἱ λαμπροὶ or the like.

2 f. For the political conditions assumed, the overthrow of the nobles by the masses, see on fr. 192. ἀγενῶν shows that in ἀγαθοὶ the political meaning is foremost.—κατανικῶνται: the compound does not seem to occur elsewhere (τάδε —or πολὺ—νικῶνται conj. Blaydes, μέγα νικῶνται Herwerden).—πρὸς: fr. 932.

4 τάδε, 'things like these,' of what has been mentioned: cf. Thuc. 2. 71 τάδε μὲν ἡμῖν πατέρες οἱ ὑμέτεροι ἔδοσαν.

85

δοκῶ μέν, οὐδείς· ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ κρεῖσσον ᾖ
καὶ δυσσεβοῦντα τῶν ἐναντίων κρατεῖν
ἢ δοῦλον αὐτὸν ὄντα τῶν πέλας κλύειν.

85 Stob. *flor.* 54. 21 (IV p. 351, 5 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀλεαδῶν (ἀλεαδῶν M, ἀλεαδων primitus A). 'δοκῶ κλύειν.'

1 'The preceding sentence must have been "Who would willingly be irreligious?" τίς ἂν ἑκὼν βούτο δυσσεβὴς εἶναι;' (H.) F. W. Schmidt needlessly wished to alter οὐδείς to ἄφρων or ἀσεβής.—δοκῶ μέν: an instance of *μέν solitarium*; for it must not be supposed that μέν is answered by ἀλλ' ὅρα. Eur. *Her.* 218 f., Soph. *O.T.* 1051 should be distinguished: in the one case ἀλλά and in the other ἀτάρ introduces the explicit contrast. For μέν accompanying and emphasizing δοκῶ and other verbs cf. Eur. *Hel.* 917 (n.), 1205, Soph. *O.C.* 905, *Inc.* 61, *Phil.* 339. Many examples in other authors are collected by Blaydes on Ar. *Pax.* 47. For *μέν solitarium* in comedy see Starkie on *Vesp.* 77; and for the orators Wyse on *Isae.* 1 1.

ὅρα μὴ ᾖ. For the subjunctive see Jebb on *Phil.* 30. Its use here in preference to the indicative shows that the speaker is rather looking forward to the circumstances of the particular case than weighing the general application of the maxim.

2 f. Several critics have missed an antithesis to δυσσεβοῦντα which they expect to find in v. 3. Thus for ἢ δοῦλον αὐτὸν ὄντα Cobet substituted ἢ τοὺς θεοὺς σέβοντα, F. W. Schmidt ἢ δαίμονας τιμῶντα, Vitelli ἢ δοῦλον αὖ θεῶν ὄντα and

Weil ἢ δοῦλον ἀγνὸν ὄντα; Papageorgius changed δοῦλον to χρηστὸν, and Nauck conjectured δειλὸν for δοῦλον. But the presence of καὶ and αὐτὸν shows that these corrections are misconceived: the thought is, 'It is better to conquer one's foes even by foul means than to be so reduced as to be the slave of others.' To a free-born Greek slavery is the worst of all evils; hence the arrogant note in αὐτόν, which contrasts as in *Phil.* 316. For the φύσει δοῦλοι the case is different. It is not so much slavery that is contrasted with sovereignty, as degradation with power once enjoyed. In Eur. *Phoen.* 524 f. εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρή, τυραννίδος πέρι | κάλλιστον ἀδικεῖν· τἄλλα δ' εὐσεβεῖν χρεών, sovereignty is taken as the supreme limit of happiness, the attainment of which justifies ἀδικία, much as here stress is laid on slavery as the extremity of misfortune. In Aesch. *Ag.* 478 the Chorus pray for the middle state: μήτ' εἴην πτολιπόρθης, | μήτ' οὖν αὐτὸς ἁλοὺς ὑπ' ἄλλῳ βίον κατίδοιμι. H. compared Trag. fr. adesp. 181 ἓα με κερδαίνοντα κεκλῆσθαι κακόν· | κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἢ σέβοντα τοὺς θεῶν νόμους | πέννητα ναίειν δόξαν ἡμποληκότα, and with v. 3 Eur. *Hel.* 730 κρεῖσσον γὰρ τόδ' (*i.e.* to be a loyal slave with a mind free) ἢ δυοῖν κακοῖν | ἓν' ὄντα χρῆσθαι, τὰς φρένας τ' ἔχειν κακάς, | ἄλλων τ' ἀκούειν δοῦλον ὄντα τῶν πέλας. Add *Ant.* 479 ὅστις δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν πέλας. Gomperz, who at one time was inclined to follow Cobet in suspecting the text, subsequently defended it on similar lines to the view taken above (*Nachlese*, p. 5).

86

παῦσαι. καταρκεῖ τοῦδε κεκλῆσθαι πατρός,
εἴπερ πέφυκά γ'· εἰ δὲ μή, μείων βλαβή.
τό τοι νομισθὲν τῆς ἀληθείας κρατεῖ.

86. **2** μείων Gesner: μείζων SA, μεῖζον M **3** τοι] τι A primitus

86 Stob. *flor.* 76. 9 (IV p. 610, 2 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεάδαις (ἀλεάδες A). 'παῦσαι...κρατεῖ.'

We may perhaps assume that these words were spoken by Telephus in reference to the supposed parentage of Heracles (or Corythus).

1 κεκλῆσθαι πατρός: cf. fr. 564 (n.). For the gen. cf. *Trach.* 1105 ὁ τῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὠνομασμένος.

2 εἴπερ πέφυκα γ'. For the meaning of εἴπερ)(εἴ γε see the exhaustive discussion by E. S. Thompson in his edition of the *Meno*, p. 258 ff. Here εἴπερ bears its common meaning of *si modo* (fr. 104 n.), but the addition of γ' changes the tone. It is impossible to reproduce the nuances of Greek particles in English; but the speech-stress, which we indicate by the use of italics in printing, may serve roughly to convey the difference between εἴπερ πέφυκα, '*If* I am his son,' and εἴπερ πέφυκά γ', 'If I *am* his son.' Cf. Plat. *Euthyphr.* 8 C τοῦτο γάρ, οἶμαι, οὐ τολμῶσι λέγειν...ὡς οὐχί, εἴπερ ἀδικοῦσί γε, δοτέον δίκην. For εἴπερ γε in dialogue see on Eur. *Phoen.* 725, 1652.—**μείων βλαβή**: *i.e.*, to be called the son of such a father rather than to learn the truth.

3 τό τοι νομισθὲν κτέ. Cf. the well-known conclusion of Gray's ode *On a distant prospect of Eton College*, 'Thought would destroy their Paradise. | No more; where ignorance is bliss, | 'tis folly to be wise.' So Eur. fr. 205 φρονῶ δ' ὃ πάσχω· καὶ τόδ' οὐ σμικρὸν κακόν· | τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι γὰρ ἡδονὴν ἔχει τινὰ | νοσοῦντα· κέρδος δ' ἐν κακοῖς ἀγνωσία. Apollod. Caryst. fr. 10 (III 284 K.) οἱ γὰρ ἀτυχοῦντες τὸν χρόνον κερδαίνομεν | ὁπόσον ἂν ἀγνοῶμεν ἠτυχηκότες. This comes from the *Hecyra*, which was translated by Terence, and the corresponding lines in his version are 286 f. *nam nos omnes, quibus est alicunde aliquis obiectus labos,* | *omne quod est interea tempus prius quam id rescitum est lucro est.* See also on fr. 583. 5. *Ai.* 554 τὸ μὴ φρονεῖν γὰρ κάρτ' ἀνώδυνον κακόν. Eur. *Bacch.* 1259 ff. *Or.* 236 κρεῖσσον δὲ τὸ δοκεῖν, κἂν ἀληθείας ἀπῇ.

87

A. ὅδ', εἰ νόθος τις, γνησίοις ἴσον σθένει.
B. ἅπαν τὸ χρηστὸν γνησίαν ἔχει φύσιν.

87. **1** ὅδ', *el* scripsi : ὁ δ' *el* codd., ὁ δὴ vulgo | τοῖς γνησίοις SM, τις τοῖς γνησίοις A : corr. Nauck | σθένοι A **2** γνησίαν Stob.: τὴν ἴσην Clem.

87 Stob. *flor.* 77. 9 (IV p. 614, 11 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεάδαις (-δες A, om. S). 'ὁ δ' . .φύσιν.' The second v. is quoted by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 6 p. 741 Σοφοκλέους δὲ ἐξ Ἀλεαδῶν 'ἅπαν τὸ χρηστὸν τὴν ἴσην ἔχει φύσιν.'

The spirit of the second line ('Tis only noble to be good') is after the manner of Euripides: *El.* 384 τῇ δ' ὁμιλίᾳ βροτοὺς | κρινεῖτε καὶ τοῖς ἤθεσιν τοὺς εὐγενεῖς. fr. 336 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐσθλὸς εὐγενὴς ἐμοιγ' ἀνήρ. fr. 53 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν κακοῖσιν εὐγένεια, | παρ' ἀγαθοῖσι δ' ἀνδρῶν. Similarly with special reference to the stigma of bastardy: *Andr.* 638 νόθοι τε πολλοὶ γνησίων ἀμείνονες. fr. 141 τῶν γνησίων γὰρ οὐδὲν ὄντες ἐνδεεῖς (*sc.* νόθοι) | νόμῳ νοσοῦσιν. fr. 168 ὀνόματι μεμπτὸν τὸ νοθον. ἡ φύσις δ' ἴση. fr. 377 μάτην δὲ θνητοὶ τοὺς νόθους φεύγουσ' ἄρα | παῖδας φυτεύειν· ὃς γὰρ ἂν χρηστὸς φύῃ, | οὐ τοὔνομ' αὐτοῦ τὴν φύσιν διαφθερεῖ.

1 f. Nauck was the first to recognize that the verses should be divided between two speakers, but his suggestion that the first line should be read as a question (οὐ δὴ νόθος τις . . σθένει ; 'surely a mere bastard is not the equal of the well-born?' with οὐ δή interrogative as in *Trach.* 668, *Phil.* 900) throws an unusual emphasis on the indefinite pronoun. I have reverted to the reading of the MSS with ὅδ' for ὁ δ' (see cr. n.): 'he, as no other bastard ...' Cf. *Trach.* 8 ὄκνον | ἄλγιστον ἔσχον, εἴ τις Αἰτωλὶς γυνή, *O. C.* 1664 ἀλλ' εἴ τις βροτῶν | θαυμαστός (sc. ἐξεπέμπετο), and the well-known attracted examples *Ai.* 488, *O. C.* 734. See also Kuehner-Gerth II 573. Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 119. Campbell, who gives the lines to a single speaker, renders: 'But he, *though in one way base*, yet copes with the legitimate.' But the translation as italicized is hard to justify. R. Ellis, on the same assumption and with a comma at σθένει, proposed οὐδ' εἰ for ὁ δ' εἰ. But no satisfactory meaning could be elicited from this, unless χρηστὸν bore the sense of *διογενές*. Blaydes conjectured (*inter alia*) ἦν δ' ἢ νόθος τις.

88

τὰ χρήματ' ἀνθρώποισιν εὑρίσκει φίλους,
αὖθις δὲ τιμάς, εἶτα τῆς ὑπερτάτης

88. **2** αὖθις] Nauck coni. εὐθύς

88 The whole passage is quoted by Stob. *flor.* 91. 27 (IV p. 740, 17 Hense) from Σοφοκλέους Ἀλεάδαι. Vv. 6—10 appear in Plut. *de aud. poet.* 4 p. 21 B as from Sophocles. V. 1 was a well-known tag: see Menander *monost.* 500, and Stob. *flor.* 94. 8 (IV p. 770, 10 Hense), where it is attributed to Sophocles without the name of the play. Plut. *de am. prol.* 5 p. 497 B attributes it to Euripides, but, as he follows with δύναμίν τε πλείστην τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἔχειν (*Phoen.* 440), it is clear that he intended to quote *Phoen.* 439. Nauck refers to Plaut. *Stich.* 522 *res amicos invenit*. It is thought that this passage is referred to by Dio Chrys. 7. 102 in the words τοῖς ἐπὶ Σοφοκλέους εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον εἰρημένοις.

1 εὑρίσκει. O. Hense suggested that this was a gloss, which had taken the place of an original ἀνῆκε, comparing Hesych. 1 p. 134 etc. But there is no reason for disturbing the text: cf. *El.* 1061.

τυραννίδος θακοῦσιν ἀγχίστην ἕδραν.
ἔπειτα δ' οὐδεὶς ἐχθρὸς οὔτε φύεται
πρὸς χρήμαθ' οἵ τε φύντες ἀρνοῦνται στυγεῖν.
δεινὸς γὰρ ἕρπειν πλοῦτος ἔς τε τἄβατα
καὶ πρὸς βέβηλα, χὠπόθεν πένης ἀνὴρ

3 *θακοῦσιν* Salmasius: *τ' ἄγουσιν* A, *ἄκουσιν* SM | *ἀγχίστην* SM: *αἰσχίστην* A, *ἡδίστην* B, *ἐσχάτην* M. Schmidt **4** sq. del. Hense **6** *δεινὸς* Plut.: *ξένος* SM, *γένος* A | *ἔς τε* Gesner: *ἔσται* Stobaei codd., *πρός τε* Plut. | *τἄβατα* (*τ' ἄβατα* codd. Plut.)] *τὰ βατὰ* Stobaei codd. **7** *βέβηλα* Vater: *τὰ βατά* Stob. Plut.

3 See cr. n. Other conjectures which have less probability are *ταγοῦσιν* Bothe, *θάκησιν* Fr. Vater and Meineke, *θάκοισιν* Ellendt, *θεοῖσιν* Weil and Wecklein. The reading of B looks like a bad conjecture, but is adopted by Dindorf (and Blaydes, who compares *O. T.* 541). For the confusion of *αἴσχιστος* and *ἔσχατος* see Cobet, *Var. Lect.* p. 144, where he corrects Lucian *Pisc.* 27. In support of *ἐσχάτην* J. refers to fr. 907 *ἤδη γὰρ ἕδρᾳ Ζεὺς ἐν ἐσχάτῃ θεῶν* (n.). Cobet, *Coll. Crit.* p. 188, perhaps rightly, prefers *ἀγχίστην*, thinking that rich men whose influence is greatest with monarchs are said *τῆς ὑπερτάτης τυραννίδος θακεῖν ἀγχίστην ἕδραν*. Mekler conj. *μακαριστὴν* and Wecklein *ἀρχικήν*. Gaisford approved *ἐχθίστην*, another word sometimes confused with *αἰσχίστην*.

4 f. are considered by O. Hense to be an intrusion, and Nauck agrees.—**ἔπειτα δ'**, *in the next place*, distinguishes from the general advantages bestowed by wealth the particular fact that no one seeks to oppose its influence. 'Not only does no one become the foe of the rich man, but even his former enemies dissemble their hatred.' Meineke's *οἵ τ' ἔχοντες* is wide of the mark.—**φύεται**, denoting 'it is no one's nature to be' (cf. Tr. fr. adesp. 543 *οὐκ ἐν γυναιξὶ φύεται πιστὴ χάρις*), corresponds to *φύντες* —those in whom the condition is realized. For the strong aor. in this sense (which L. and S. wrongly say is rare) see *Ant.* 721 *φῦναι τὸν ἄνδρα πάντ' ἐπιστήμης πλέων* ('prove to be'), *O. C.* 1444 *ταῦτα δ' ἐν τῷ δαίμονι | καὶ τῇδε φῦναι χἀτέρᾳ* ('to be realized'), and many other instances in Sophocles. For *τε* co-ordinated with *οὔτε* see Jebb on *O. C.* 1397 f., and Eur. *Hel.* 156, *Hclid.* 454, *Phoen.* 891.

7 f. See cr. n. Other conjectures are *γε τὰ βατά* Blomfield (*τὰ βατά γε* Blaydes), *τὰ βάσιμα* Nauck, *καὶ τἀπρόσικτα* Campbell, *τὰ βαιά* Schwartz, *τὰ λευρά* Hense. For the word *βέβηλος* see on fr. 570. There can be no reasonable doubt that *τὰ βατά* was a gloss on *βέβηλα*: see schol. on *O. C.* 10 *βεβήλοις*] *βατοῖς*, Suid. *s.v. βέβηλος τόπος: ὁ βατὸς πᾶσι καὶ ἀκάθαρτος. Etym. M. s.v. βέβηλος: ὁ μὴ ἱερὸς τόπος ἀκάθαρτος καὶ βατός.* Bekk. *anecd.* p. 323, 13 *ἀβέβηλα τὰ ἄβατα χωρία.* Schol. Aesch. *Suppl.* 518 *βέβηλον ἅλσος*] *τὸ πᾶσι βατὸν καὶ μὴ ἱερόν.* We might equally well have found *τὰ βάσιμα*, another scholiastic word, which Nauck actually wished to put in the text. Madvig (*Adv. Crit.* p. 614) depraved it still further by proposing *χὤποι θέλει· πένης δ' ἀνήρ.* It will be observed that the addition of *βέβηλα* is redundant to the sense, and serves merely to round off the expression. The Greek love of antithesis was sometimes indulged at the expense of logic: *El.* 305 *τὰς οὔσας τέ μοι | καὶ τὰς ἀπούσας ἐλπίδας διέφθορεν, Ant.* 1109 *ἵν' ἵν' ὀπάονες, | οἵ τ' ὄντες οἵ τ' ἀπόντες.* See also my note on Eur. *Hclid.* 182 (with which passage Andoc. 4. 7 should be compared), and add Alcman fr. 23, 44 *ἐμὲ δ' οὔτ' ἐπαινῆν | οὔτε μωμήσθαι νιν ἀ κλεννὰ χοραγὸς | οὐδ' ἀμὼς ἐᾷ.* J. quotes Tr. fr. adesp. 436 *δοῦλε, δεσποτῶν ἄκουε καὶ δίκαια κἄδικα*, and 437. The subject is treated exhaustively by E. Kemmer, *die polare Ausdrucksweise*, 1903.

χὠπόθεν κτέ. The general sense is: 'And to such places where the poor man could not even obtain access so as to realize his desires.' The rich man alone has the *entrée* to influential quarters. We may illustrate by *O. T.* 597 f., where Creon parades the value of his influence with Oedipus: *νῦν οἱ σέθεν χρῄζοντες ἐκκαλοῦσί με· | τὸ γὰρ τυχεῖν αὐτοῖσι πᾶν ἐνταῦθ' ἔνι.* Either **οὐδ'** or *μηδ'* would serve, and J. preferred the generic *μηδ'*, quoting *Trach.* 800 *ἐνταῦθ' ὅπου με μή τις ὄψεται βροτῶν*; but it seems

οὐδ' ἐντυχὼν δύναιτ' ἂν ὧν ἐρᾷ τυχεῖν.
καὶ γὰρ δυσειδὲς σῶμα καὶ δυσώνυμον
γλώσσῃ σοφὸν τίθησιν εὔμορφόν τ' ἰδεῖν.
μόνῳ δὲ χαίρειν κἂν νόσων ξυνουσίᾳ
πάρεστιν αὐτῷ κἀπικρύπτεσθαι κακά.

8 οὐδ' ἐντυχὼν Plut. : μηδ' εὐτυχὼν (—ὢν A) Stobaei codd. **9** δυσειδὲς καὶ σῶμα καὶ A | δυσώνυμον: v. comm. **11** κἂν νόσων ξυνουσίᾳ Meineke : καὶ νοσεῖν ἐξουσία codd. **12** κἀπικρύπτεσθαι Blaydes : κἀπικρύψασθαι SM, κἀπικρύψεσθαι A, κἀποκρύπτεσθαι Nauck

more likely that οὐδέ would be supplanted by μηδέ than vice versa : see Cobet, *Var. Lect.* pp. 47, 315.—**ἐντυχών** is used in the special sense of *interviewing, obtaining an audience*: cf. Dem. 19. 175 αὐτὸς δὲ ἰδίᾳ πάντα τὸν χρόνον ἐντυγχάνων οὐδ' ὁτιοῦν ἐταύσατο Φιλίππῳ. This sense became very common in later Greek : hence ἔντευξις, ἐντευκτικός, δυσέντευκτος, and even ἐντευξίδιον (*a petition*).—The careless repetition of τυχεῖν after ἐντυχὼν is excused by the meaning of the latter : Eur. *Hel.* 674 (n.). Meineke's οὐδ' εὐστοχῶν is unnecessary.—The negative qualifies both the participle and the main verb, as in Aesch. *Ag.* 302 δ δ' οὔτι μέλλων οὐδ' ἀφρασμόνως ὕπνῳ | νικώμενος παρῆκεν ἀγγέλου μέρος : see n. on Eur. *Heracl.* 813.—The explanation recommended above is confirmed by the emphasis which falls more strongly upon οὐδ' ἐντυχὼν than upon τυχεῖν. J., however, joins τυχεῖν to δεινός, interpreting : 'And knows how to obtain the objects of its desire in quarters from which the poor man could not obtain those objects, even if they came in his way.' In other words, 'Wealth wins its way to places which are wholly inaccessible to poverty. But even in quarters to which poverty may chance to have access, wealth succeeds where the other fails.' Tucker proposed μηδ' ἐν γ' ὑπνῳ quoting Solon ap. Arist. *Ath. pol.* 12 (p. 48 S.), but the change is unnecessary. So also is Wecklein's assumption that after δύναιτ' ἄν something like εἰρᾶσιν πόρων, | ἐκεῖνος αἰὲν οἶδεν is needed. Headlam (*C. R.* xv 99 n.) favoured εὐτυχών, and so Blaydes (see cr. n.).—For ὧν ἐρᾷ τυχεῖν see on fr. 356.

9 f. καὶ γὰρ δυσειδὲς κτέ. Observe that καί ('even') qualifies the following adjectives, although in such cases it is more usual for γάρ to be postponed (καὶ δυσειδὲς γάρ). Cf. *Trach.* 92 καὶ γὰρ ἐστέρηκ' τό γ' εὖ | πράσσειν κέρδος ἐμπολᾷ, with Jebb's note. See also Kuehner-Gerth II 338.—**δυσώνυμον** in this context has given rise to much suspicion : thus Meineke boldly substituted γῆρας νέον for **γλώσσῃ σοφόν**, coll. Eur. fr. 575 ; Wecklein changed γλώσσῃ to γνώμην, with δυσειδῆ for δυσειδές ; Blaydes read κάνδρα δύστομον for καὶ δυσώνυμον ; J. proposed καὶ δύσθρουν στόμα, comparing Pind. *P.* 4. 63 δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ('slow speech'—of Βάττος, the stammerer). But I am not convinced that δυσώνυμον is unintelligible, though it cannot mean, as Brunck suggested, *prave loquentem*. The description exactly fits the personality of Thersites, whom Sophocles may have had in mind : he too was 'hated for his tongue,' cf. Hom. B 222 τῷ δ' ἄρ' Ἀχαιοὶ | ἐκπάγλως κοτέοντο νεμέσσηθέν τ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ. On this view, γλώσσῃ should be connected with δυσώνυμον, which is an epic word and is employed in the epic sense: T 371 ἤδε δὴ ὡς εἰσὶ δυσώνυμοι ἥ μ' Ὀδυσῆος | οἶκον ἀποσχήσει—'that accursed day is at hand....' Note the chiasmus, by which εὔμορφον relates to δυσειδές, and σοφόν to δυσώνυμον.

11 f. κἂν νόσων ξυνουσίᾳ. See cr. n. There are several other conjectures (καὶ νοσεῖν Ellendt, ἀφαιρεῖν καὶ νόσων ξυνουσίαν O. Hense, ἀμαυροῦν καὶ νόσων ξυνουσίαν Holzner, κἀνοσεῖν ἐξουσία Bergk, ἀνοσίων or κἀνόμων ἐξουσίᾳ F. W. Schmidt, ἴδῃ νόσουσ' ἐξουσία Enger, καὶ νοσοῦντ' ἐξουσία Papabasileios), but none so satisfactory as Meineke's, which J. and H. accepted. H. points out that the Greeks did not say ἐξουσία πάρεστι but merely πάρεστι or ἔξεστι, or ἐξουσία (ἐστί) : therefore ἐξουσία cannot stand. Moreover, the sense requires not χαίρειν καὶ νοσεῖν but χαίρειν καὶ νοσοῦντι, or, in a synonymous phrase, καὶ νόσῳ ξυνόντι : *O. T.* 303 οἷς νόσῳ σύνεστιν, *Ai.* 338 τοῖς πάλαι νοσήμασι ξυνοῦσι, Eur. *fr.* 1079 ταύτῃ τῇ νόσῳ ξυνών, *Phil.* 320 ὅταν δὲ πλησθῇς τῆς νόσου ξυνουσίας. Wealth can be happy in spite of sickness because it can afford

to pay physicians for a cure: Eur. *El.* 427 *σκοπῶ τὰ χρήμαθ' ὡς ἔχει μέγα σθένος, | ξένοις τε δοῦναι σῶμά τ' ἐς νόσους πεσὸν | δαπάναισι σῶσαι.* So in a *Comparison of Wealth and Virtue* (Stob. *flor.* 91. 33) Wealth *ἐσεμνύνετο χρείας ἀνθρώπων διορθοῦν,...πρέπειν μὲν εἰρήνῃ, πολέμοις δὲ παρέχειν, θεραπεύειν δ' ἐκ νόσων...νόσοι δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰσίν, ἐφ' ἃ πάντα δεῖ χρημάτων.*—Wecklein's change of *χαίρειν* to *χλίειν* is unnecessary.

For the general sense H. quoted Menand. fr. 90 (III 28 K.) *πλοῦτος δὲ πολλῶν ἐπικάλυμμ' ἐστιν κακῶν*, and fr. 485 (III 140 K.) *τοῦτο μόνον ἐπισκοτεῖ | καὶ δυσγενείᾳ καὶ τρόπου πονηρίᾳ, | καὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἔσχηκεν ἄνθρωπος κακοῖς, | τὸ πολλὰ κεκτῆσθαι· τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐλέγχεται.*

He also urged, as against Nauck's reading, that *ἐπικρύπτεσθαι* rather than *ἀποκρύπτεσθαι* is the *vox propria* in the sense of *to cloak*: but the inference is by no means certain. Cf. Eur. fr. 416 (Stob. *flor.* 4. 9) *τῷ θρασεῖ τὰς συμφορὰς | ζητοῦσ' ἀμαυροῦν κἀπικρύπτεσθαι* (Trinc., *κἄποκ.* MA, Nauck) *κακά.* fr. 553 *ἐκμαρτυρεῖν γὰρ ἄνδρα τὰς αὐτοῦ τύχας | εἰς πάντας ἀμαθές, τὸ δ' ἐπικρύπτεσθαι σοφόν.* In fr. 460. 2 *χρὴ περιστεῖλαι καλῶς | κρύπτοντα καὶ μὴ πᾶσι κηρύσσειν τάδε*, the simple verb is found. Bruno Keil (*Herm.* XXIII 379) adduced Isocr. 1. 42 in support of Nauck's reading. For the moral precept which enjoined the concealment of misfortune see on frs. 83, 653.

89

νομὰς δέ τις κεροῦσσ' ἀπ' ὀρθίων πάγων
καθεῖρπεν ἔλαφος . . . .
. . . . . .
ἄρασα μύξας . . καὶ κερασφόρους
στόρθυγγας εἶρφ' ἕκηλος

89 Aelian *nat. an.* 7. 39 *ὅσοι λέγουσι θῆλυν ἔλαφον κέρατα οὐ φύειν, οὐκ αἰδοῦνται τοὺς τοῦ ἐναντίου μάρτυρας, Σοφοκλέα μὲν εἰπόντα 'νομὰς...ἔλαφος' καὶ πάλιν 'ἄρασα...ἔκηλος.' καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὁ τοῦ Σοφίλλου ἐν τοῖς Ἀλεάδαις.* V. 1 is partly quoted by *Etym. Gud.* p. 317, 12 (*Etym. Paris.* p. 1444 E) and Zon. *lex. s.v. κερόεις* p. 1186 *κεροῦσσα, οἷον 'νόμος δέ τι κεροῦσα'·* <Ἡρωδιανὸς> *περὶ παθῶν*, and referred to by Pollux 5. 76 *τῶν δὲ ἐλάφων ἄκερως μὲν ἡ θήλεια, ὁ δὲ ἄρρην κερωφόρος,.....καὶ χρυσόκερως ὁ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους ἁλούς. καὶ Ἀνακρέων* (fr. 51) *μὲν σφάλλεται κερόεσσαν ἔλαφον προσειπών, καὶ Σοφοκλῆς κεροῦσσαν τὴν Τηλέφου τροφόν.* V. 3 is referred to by Pollux 2. 72 *παρὰ δὲ Σοφοκλεῖ καὶ μύξαι οἱ μυκτῆρες κέκληνται.*

1 Aelian continues his evidence from the poets by citing Eur. fr. 857, fr. 740, Pind. *Ol.* 3. 29, Anacreon fr. 51 *ἀγανῶς οἷά τε νεβρὸν νεοθηλέα | γαλαθηνόν, ὅς τ' ἐν ὕλῃ κεροέσσῃς | ὑπολειφθεὶς ὑπὸ μητρὸς ἐπτοήθη.* Add Simonid. fr. 30 *θάνατον κεροέσσᾳ εὑρέμεν ματεύων ἐλάφῳ*, Eur. *Her.* 375 *τὰν χρυσοκάρανον δόρκα.* The zoologists and grammarians were eager to point out the blunder: Arist. *h. a.* 4. 11. 538^{b} 18, *poet.* 25. 1460^{b} 31 *ἔλαττον γὰρ* (*sc.* *ἁμάρτημα*) *εἰ μὴ ᾔδει ὅτι ἔλαφος θήλεια κέρατα οὐκ ἔχει ἢ εἰ ἀμιμήτως ἔγραψεν*, schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3. 52 *ἐπιμελῶς οἱ ποιηταὶ τὴν θήλειαν ἔλαφον κέρατα ἔχουσαν εἰσάγουσιν, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν θηλάζουσαν τὸν Τήλεφον γράφουσι καὶ πλάττουσι.* The mistake is generally accounted for by the consideration that legend loves the miraculous, and is not content to follow the prosaic limits of science; but Ridgeway in *Early Age of Greece*, 1 p. 360 ff., holds that the story of Heracles reflects a knowledge of the existence of the reindeer in northern Europe. In that case we must suppose other miraculous does were given antlers on the analogy of this famous quest.—**νομάς**: *roaming.* See Jebb on *O. T.* 1350.—**ὀρθίων πάγων.** Dindorf quotes *Ant.* 985 *ὀρθόκροδοι ὑπὲρ πάγου.*

2 Wagner suggested as a supplement *Τηλέφου νέου τροφός.*

3 **μύξας**=*μυκτῆρας.* Cf. Phot. *lex.* p. 280, 3 *μύξαν· αὐτὸν τὸν μυκτῆρα καλοῦσιν, οὐχὶ τὸ ὑγρόν· οὕτως Ἀριστοφάνης* (fr. 820, 1 580 K.). Similarly Hesych. III p. 128.—Meineke, who would have preferred *μυξωτῆρε* but for the evidence of Pollux, fills up the gap by reading *μύξας <ὕψι>*. Blaydes supplied *δεῦρο.* —**κερασφόρους**: observe the transference of the epithet, and see n. on fr. 11.

90

ἐφυμνεῖς

90 Hesych. II p. 244 *ἐφυμνεῖς· ἐπᾴδεις. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεάδαις.*

ἐφυμνεῖν is to *chant over*, and both it and *ἐπᾴδειν* may be construed with acc. of the theme and dat. of the person affected. It is probable that the verb was used here with the same simple sense as in Aesch. *Eum.* 903 *τί οὖν μ' ἄναγνας τῇδ' ἐφυμνῆσαι χθονί;*

91

φρονεῖν

91 Erotian *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 84. 2 *κατεφρόνει· κατενόει. φρονεῖν γὰρ ἔλεγον οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ νοεῖν, ὡς καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἀντιόπῃ* (fr. 205) *φάσκει· 'φρονῶ δ' ὃ πάσχω· καὶ τόδ' οὐ μικρὸν κακόν.' μέμνηται καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀλεάδαις* (ἀχαιάδι *codd.*: corr. Schleusner) *καὶ ἐν Ἀμφιαράῳ* (fr. 119).

Similar statements are made by *Etym. M.* p. 800, 43 *φρονεῖν σημαίνει καὶ τὸ νοεῖν* and Hesych. IV p. 259. There are several such passages in Sophocles: *Trach.* 1145 *φρονῶ δὴ ξυμφορᾶς ἴν' ἑστάμεν*, *ib.* 289 *φρόνει νιν ὡς ἥξοντα*, *Ant.* 49, 996, *O.C.* 872, and others. The examples are not well arranged in Ellendt.

ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ

Fr. 93 confirms the view generally held that the story of the play is to be found in Hygin. *fab.* 91, and is therefore similar to that of the *Alexandros* of Euripides, which was put on the stage with the *Troades* in 415 B.C. When Hecuba was pregnant with Paris, she dreamed that she gave birth to a flaming torch, from which a number of snakes crawled forth. The diviners held that the welfare of Troy depended on the destruction of the child to be born. Consequently, when Alexandros was born, he was sent away to be killed; but his guards pitied him and were content to expose him, with the result that he was discovered by some shepherds, who reared him as their own son, and called him by the name Paris. Paris grew to maturity among the herds on Mt Ida, and made a special favourite of one of the bulls. At length Priam determined to celebrate funeral games in honour of his child long since lost, and sent some of his servants to choose a bull as prize for the victor in one of the contests. The bull of Paris was selected, and he was so much distressed in consequence that he went down to the town, entered for the contest, and defeated all his opponents, including his own brothers. Deiphobus[1], in anger at the success of a

[1] Or Hector, according to Servius.

clown, drew his sword upon him; but Paris took refuge at the altar of Ζεὺς ἑρκεῖος. Cassandra then declared that the newcomer was her brother, and Priam recognised his son (by means of certain *crepundia*[1], according to Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 5. 370), and welcomed him to the palace. Of course there is nothing to connect Sophocles with any particular details in the above account; and we are not in a position to distinguish the treatment of Euripides from that of Sophocles.

Robert (*Bild und Lied*, pp. 233—239) undertook to show that the story concerning the dream of Hecuba and the exposure of Paris, his rescue and ultimate restoration to his home, was not, as Welcker believed (*Ep. Cycl.* II 90), contained in the *Cypria*, but was the invention of the fifth century, and in all probability of Sophocles in the *Alexandros*, in the composition of which he was largely influenced by the Herodotean account of the youth of Cyrus (1 108 ff.). He had an easy task in demolishing the argument by which Welcker attempted to establish the indispensability of the story to the narrative of the *Cypria*, viz. that the circumstances of the judgment of Paris presuppose his residence on Ida, and that this in its turn implies his escape from exposure; for his adoption of a pastoral life was in no way inconsistent with his recognition as one of the princely family of Priam. But there is a wide gap between the admission that the origin of the story cannot be traced to the *Cypria* and the conclusion that Sophocles was its author. Even if Robert is correct in his inference from *Tro.* 919 ff. and *Androm.* 293 ff. that in the latter passage Euripides followed an older and simpler version, according to which Hecuba refused to surrender Paris to death, notwithstanding the vaticinations of Cassandra—a conclusion which is by no means certain—it helps very little towards the result which Robert desired to establish. Moreover, the discovery of the fragments of Pindar's *Paeans* has destroyed the foundation of Robert's theory; for in 8. 27 ff. there is an unmistakable allusion to Hecuba's dream. But, apart from this, the onus of strictly proving their case lies on those who seek to show that any tragic plot was *invented* by its author; if even Euripides, so far as we can tell, never dared to do anything of the kind, we may be quite sure that Sophocles was far less likely to make the experiment.

It will be observed that Hyginus states that Alexandros was the name originally given to the child, and that Paris was

[1] The detail is suggestive of a tragic origin, and is referred by Ahrens to Euripides. On the other hand, there seems to be no reason for tracing to Sophocles the statement of Asclepiades (*FHG* III 303) that the slave who exposed Paris was called Archialos (Agelaus, according to Apollod. 3. 149).

substituted by the shepherds. The exact opposite is asserted by Eur. fr. 64: cf. Enn. trag. fr. 38, Ov. *Her.* 16. 358, and perhaps Eur. *I.A.* 1293 (Murray). Apollodorus (3. 150) says that the shepherds who originally found him called him Paris, and that his exploits subsequently earned for him the name of Alexandros. Are we to infer that Hyginus followed Sophocles rather than Euripides?

92

οὐ γάρ τι θεσμὰ τοῖσιν ἀστίταις πρέπει

92 Steph. Byz. p. 139, 19 *ἄστυ...ὁ πολίτης ἀστός καὶ ἀστή, καὶ ἀστόν. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀστὸς τὸ ἀστίτης.* Σοφοκλῆς *Ἀλεξάνδρῳ* '*οὐ γάρ...πρέπει*' καὶ (fr. 93) '*βοτῆρα ...γάρ;*'

οὐ γάρ τι is a favourite combination in tragedy, with *τι* sometimes qualifying a single word, sometimes the whole clause. See on Eur. *Heracl.* 193, *Phoen.* 112. Its exact force cannot be determined here: cf. frs. 755, 856, *Ai.* 1343, *O.T.* 433, *Ant.* 450. Wecklein's view that the line is interrogative is therefore improbable.—**ἀστίταις.** The formation is analogous to *χωρίτης* (fr. 21), *αὐλίτης* (fr. 502), *ἀκτίτης* (fr. 68). The history of these words is obscure. According to Kretschmer in *KZ* XXXI 343 the long *ι* is original (*πολῖτης*: *πόλι-ς*) and is retained under the influence of the accent. (Cf. *πρισβῦτης*: *πρέσβυ-ς*.) Then *ῑ* passed to other stems. Besides *ἀκλίτης* and *ὀδίτης* other examples are *αὐτίτης*, *Αὐξίτης* (Pausan. 8. 26. 1), *ἀσπιδίτης*, *ἀντρίτης*, *ποιμνίτης*, *ὁρίτης*, *ἑδρίτης*, *ἐσπερίτης*, *δενδρίτης*.

93

βοτῆρα νικᾶν ἄνδρας ἀστίτας. τί γάρ;

93 Quoted by Steph. Byz.: see on fr. 92.

The syntax is ambiguous, but the order of the words makes the meaning absolutely clear: the emphatic word is, as usual, put first. '*A herdsman* the winner —against townsmen too!' Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 885 *τὸν ζῶντα καίνειν τοὺς τεθνηκότας λέγω.* H. remarks that Tr. fr. adesp. 188 *ὦ Ζεῦ, γένοιτο καταβαλεῖν τὸν σὸν ἐμὲ* was quoted by grammarians as an example of ambiguity; and adds that, if Zeus really mistook the meaning, he must have been very imperfectly acquainted with Greek usage.—**βοτῆρα** is Paris, who was habitually called *βοτήρ* or *βουκόλος*: see Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 718 ff. For the story see the Introductory Note.—**ἄνδρας ἀστίτας.** The addition of *ἄνδρας* here is probably complimentary, although it might be the reverse, emphasizing, as it does, either praise or blame. It is depreciatory in *O.T.* 1118 *ὡς νομεὺν ἀνήρ*, and in *Ant.* 690 *ἀνδρὶ δημότῃ*. See Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 159, Starkie on Ar. *Vesp.* 289, *Ach.* 168. Examples are collected by Blaydes on Ar. *Lys.* 368.—**τί γάρ;** when used in a continuous speech, challenges contradiction. 'What else?' 'What then?' So in Aesch. *Ag.* 1134 *οὐδὲν ποτ' εἰ μὴ ξυνθανουμένῳ. τί γάρ; id.* 1238, *Cho.* 879. In answers it becomes virtually a formula of assent: see *e.g.* Plat. *Theaet.* 209 B. The words are obviously appropriate to the circumstances of Paris's victory in the *ἀγών*.

94

στείχων δ' ἀγρώστην ὄχλον

94 Schol. A Hom. E 158 τὸ δὲ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν 'Αλεξάνδρῳ 'στείχων δ' ἀγρώστην ὄχλον' παρώνυμον. The same is found in Eustath. *Il.* p. 533, 40, who omits δ' after στείχων and gives 'Αλεξάνδρα for 'Αλεξάνδρῳ. The word ἀγρώστης is introduced as analogous to the Homeric χηρωστής.

There is nothing to indicate that ὄχλον is related to στείχων as the goal of its action: 'approaching the rustic crowd.' But the construction is quite possible, although less common than when the acc. is a place-name: cf. *O.T.* 713 ὡς αὐτὸν ἥξοι μοῖρα πρὸς παιδὸς θανεῖν. Jebb on *Phil.* 141, fr. 314. 238, Eur. *Phoen.* 977 (n.), *Hipp.* 1371, *Bacch.* 848, Pind. *Isth.* 2. 48. There is in any case no need to alter the text (στείχοντ' Nauck formerly, στέργω δ' F. W. Schmidt). Mekler would complete the line with εὑρήσεις μέγαν or the like.

ἀγρώστης beside ἀγρότης and ἀγρώτης, shows a non-essential σ which comes by analogy from the verbal class. Wecklein (on Eur. *Rhes.* 287, *Her.* 377) wishes to restore ἀγρώτης everywhere in tragedy, and Murray adopts ἀγρώταις as better attested in *Rhes.* 266. In *Bacch.* 564 ἀγρώτας is read by all. There seems no reason to doubt that both forms existed, but it is difficult to choose between them when the copies differ. Hesych. 1 p. 31 has ἀγρῶσται· ἐργάται, θηρευταί, where the second interpretation suggests a derivation from ἀγρώσσω; and this is the meaning in Apoll. Rhod. 4. 175. In tragedy however the word always means 'countryman.' See also on fr. 314, 33.

95

ἀμαλθεύειν

95 Phot. ed. Reitz. p 86, 9 ἀμαλθεύειν ...τρέφειν. Σοφοκλῆς 'Αλεξάνδρῳ. ἔνθεν καὶ ἡ 'Αμάλθεια.

The existence of ἀμαλθεύειν was previously known only from Hesych. 1 p. 137 ἀμαλθεύει· πληθύνει, πλουτίζει. ἢ τρέφει. *Etym.M.* p. 76, 38 ἀμαλθεύσει πλήθει αὔξει. The authority of the word is considerably strengthened by the new evidence; and there is no longer any probability in Gruppe's suggestion (p. 3411) that it was formed from the name Amalthea. Rather we should suppose that the noun and verb existed side by side, and that the idea of *abundance* or *plenty* was personified or deified in the various forms familiar to Greek legend. It should be observed that the earliest allusions to Amalthea (Pind. in schol. Hom. Φ 194, Pherecydes fr. 37, *FHG* 1 82) represent her as a nymph in whose possession was the horn of plenty, and that the Cretan legend of the goat Amalthea which suckled Zeus is attested only by later writers. That is to say, the name Amalthea appears at a comparatively late date to have been transferred to the nameless Αἴξ οὐρανία (Zenob. 1. 26, 2. 48). Further, the fact that κέρας ἀμαλθείας was an attribute of various deities (Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa 1 1721) indicates that Amalthea was not a distinctively conceived personality. The etymology of Amalthea is uncertain, and the suggestions which have been put forward (collected by Gruppe, p. 8249) are not satisfactory. But the meaning points to a connexion with ἀμαλός and ἀμάλη (=ἡ τριχῶν αὔξησις *Etym. M.*).

96

δύσαυλος

96 Hesych. 1 p. 542 δύσαυλος· δυσαύλιστος. Σοφοκλῆς 'Αλεξάνδρῳ (ἀλεξαν δ cod.).

Cf. *Ant.* 359 δυσαύλων πάγων ἐναίθρεια καὶ δύσομβρα φεύγειν βέλη, where the schol.'s note is δυσχερῆ τὸν ἐπαυλισμὸν ποιούντων. Aesch. *Ag.* 560 μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαυλίας. The reference is perhaps to the shepherds' life on Mt Ida,

97

Ἐφέσεια

97 Steph. Byz. p. 289, 19 Ἔφεσος...τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἐφέσιος. εὕρηται καὶ Ἐφέσεια διὰ διφθόγγου· οὕτω γὰρ ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Σοφοκλῆς.

The form Ἐφέσειος is also found occasionally on inscriptions: see *e.g.* Hicks, *Manual* 151, 10 ἀναγγεῖλαι τοῖς Ἐφεσείοις, *CIG* II 2228 Ἀρτέμιδι Ἐφεσείῃ, *ib.* 3345 Ἐφέσειος. Cf. Βοσπόρειος in fr. 707.

But why did Stephanus record the neut. plural, if it was used merely as an adjective? Did Sophocles by an anachronism refer to the Pan-Ionic festival of the Ephesia (Thuc. 3. 104)? An allusion to the magic letters is unlikely.

98

Θηλάστρια

98 Hesych. II p. 314 *Θηλάστρια· τροφός. ἔστι δὲ Ἰακόν.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεξάνδρῳ.

Θηλάστρια. For the formation of these feminine *nomina agentis* see Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.* II p. 336 E. tr. *Θηλάστρια* is formed from *Θηλάζω*, and may be compared with *εὐνήτρια* (beside *εὐνήτειρα* for *εὐνητερ-ια*) and *αὐλήτρια*. The word is quoted from the comic poets, and is certainly not exclusively Ionic in usage. It appears however that in the *κοινή* the verb *Θηλάζω* came to mean *to suck*, although in classical Greek it was regularly applied to the mother. This fact is noticed in Suidas and Photius, for whose readers the ancient usage required explanation. Hence Photius (p. 90, 24) explains *Θηλάστριαν* by *ἣν Θηλάσεταί τις* from the point of view of his own age, and his gloss on *Θηλάζειν* sufficiently accounts for Hesychius calling *Θηλάστρια* an Ionism: *τὸ τρέφειν τῷ γάλακτι οἱ ἀρχαῖοι πάντες· οὕτως μάλιστα οἱ Ἴωνες.*

Ahrens suggested that the word was an epithet of the she-bear which suckled Paris.

99

μαιεύτριαν

99 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 108, 31 *μαιεύτριαν· ἀντὶ τοῦ μαῖαν.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεξάνδρῳ.

The meaning is that Soph. used *μαιεύτριαν* as = *nurse*, although Photius (*lex.* p. 241, 9) shows that the Attic use of *μαῖα* for a *midwife* was well known to the grammarians. For the formation see on fr. 98.

100

μνείαν

100 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 107, 25 *μνείαν· τὴν μνήμην.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. The same gloss is assigned to Sophocles by Phot. *lex.* p. 272, 17 and Suid. *s.v.*, but without the name of a play.

The word is by no means uncommon, and there is no ground for Nauck's suggestion that Ἀλεξάνδρῳ is a corruption for Ἡλέκτρᾳ, *i.e.* with a reference to *El.* 392 *βίον δὲ τοῦ παρόντος οὐ μνείαν ἔχειν.*

ΑΛΗΤΗΣ

The title is only quoted by Stobaeus (*floril.*), and by him always as Ἀλεύτης. A tragedy with the title Ἀλήτης is attributed to Lycophron by Suidas *s.v.*

It is generally agreed that the title-rôle belongs to Aletes, the son of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra, and that Welcker (p. 215) was right in finding the substance of the plot in Hygin. *fab.* 122. The story there related is as follows. Electra received a false message that Orestes and Pylades had been sacrificed to Artemis at Tauri. Aletes, the son of Aegisthus, on learning that no survivor of the race of the Atridae was left, usurped the sovereignty at Mycenae. Electra set out to Delphi to enquire of the oracle concerning her brother's death. On the same day that she reached her destination, Iphigenia and Orestes also happened to arrive; and the same messenger who had brought the news about Orestes pointed out Iphigenia as his murderess. Hearing this, Electra snatched a blazing brand from the altar, and in her ignorance would have blinded Iphigenia, but for the timely interference of Orestes. A recognition followed, and they returned together to Mycenae. Here Orestes killed Aletes, and would also have slain his sister Erigone, had not Artemis carried her away and made her a priestess in Attica. Orestes then married Hermione, and Pylades Electra.

Welcker conjectured that fr. 646 belongs here, thinking that Tyndareus appeared as the guardian of Aletes, and held that frs. 104, 105 are part of a dialogue between Aletes and Orestes.

Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* p. 469) finds the same plot in the *Agamemnonidae* of Accius. Whereas Welcker saw in Hyginus sufficient material for two tragedies, Ribbeck preserved the unity of place by supposing that Aletes and Erigone went to Delphi in furtherance of a plot against Orestes and Iphigenia. Comparing frs. 101—103 with *Agamemnonidae* fr. 11 he thinks that Aletes was represented as a hypocritical and specious talker. Fr. 107 suits the circumstances of Agamemnon's and Aegisthus' children.

For the proposed identification with the *Erigone* see p. 173. Hense has recently revived a suggestion originally made by Bergk that the *Aletes* was a late play. He is thus able to account for the Euripidean tone of fr. 107. He points out that εἰς ἔλεγχον ἰέναι (fr. 105) is used by Sophocles only in the *Philoctetes* and *Oedipus Coloneus*, and that fr. 104 echoes *O.C.* 75.

101

ψυχὴ γὰρ εὔνους καὶ φρονοῦσα τοὔνδικον κρείσσων σοφιστοῦ παντός ἐστιν εὑρετίς.

101. **2** *κρεῖττον* A | *εὑρετής* M

101 Stob. *flor.* 3. 8 (III p. 194, 1 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλείτῃ. '*ψυχὴ...εὑρετίς.*' The extract is not in S.

'A loving heart and an honest purpose will learn the truth sooner than any adept.' Ellendt thinks that *παντός* is neuter and dependent on *εὑρετίς*; but the meaning is the same in either case, and it seems unnatural to sever *σοφιστοῦ παντός*. The rhythm is the same as in *El.* 76.—**σοφιστής** has no exact English equivalent. The gloss *πᾶς τεχνίτης* (Phot. *lex.* p. 528, 25) gives the best general interpretation; but the remark of the same lexicographer *τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν σοφιστὴς ὁ σοφὸς ἐκαλεῖτο*, which L. and S. have adopted without sufficient restriction, must be understood to apply to trained intellect as distinguished from natural ability. At an early stage of civilization the attainment of a high degree of such general culture as the times admit wears the aspect of a specialized branch of learning: it is from this point of view that Thales and the rest (*συνετοί τινες καὶ νομοθετικοί* Diog. L. 1. 40) were called *σοφισταί* (Hdt. 1. 29)—'Wise Men' rather than 'wise men.' With the present passage cf. Eur. fr. 905 *μισῶ σοφιστήν, ὅστις οὐχ αὑτῷ σοφός.*

The thought that character is more effective than wisdom may be illustrated by Menand. fr. 472, 7 III 135 K. *τρόπος ἔσθ' ὁ πείθων τοῦ λέγοντος, οὐ λόγος.* Cf. Plut. *Phoc.* 5: Demosthenes called Phocion the *κοπίς* of his speeches. *ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἴσως πρὸς τὸ ἦθος ἀνοιστέον· ἐπεὶ καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ νεῦμα μόνον ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ μυρίοις ἐνθυμήμασι καὶ περιόδοις ἀντίρροπον ἔχει πίστιν*, *Demosth.* 10, Stob. *flor.* 37. 34. It may be added that the parliamentary influence ascribed to the late Duke of Devonshire was of a similar character.

εὑρετίς. The accentuation is disputed: see Chandler, § 38, who decides in favour of *εὑρέτις* because of the acc. *εὑρέτιν* in Diod. 1. 25.

102

βραχεῖ λόγῳ δὲ πολλὰ πρόσκειται σοφά.

102 *δὲ πολλὰ* SM: *καὶ πολλὰ* A

102 Stob. *flor.* 35. 4 (III p. 688, 8 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλείτῃ (so MA. S omits the name of the play). '*βραχεῖ... σοφά.*'

Cf. Eur. fr. 28 *σοφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ὅστις ἐν βραχεῖ | πολλοὺς καλῶς οἷός τε συντέμνειν λόγους*, and Polonius' 'Since brevity is the soul of wit' (*Haml.* ii. 2. 90).

πολλὰ σοφά, as *πολλὰ καλά* (fr. 81), *πολλὰ σοφά* (Eur. *Suppl.* 903, Tr. fr. adesp. 509). But *πολλὰ χρηστά θ'* occurs in *Phil.* 583, where see Jebb. **πρόσκειται** is sometimes merely a synonym of *πρόσεστι*, *belongs to*; and so is applied to permanent qualities. The nearest parallel in Soph. is *Ant.* 1243 *τὴν ἀβουλίαν | ὅσῳ μέγιστον ἀνδρὶ πρόσκειται κακόν.* Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 970 *τὸ δ' ἄρσεν αὐτοὺς ὠφελεῖ προσκείμενον*, *Rhes.* 266 *ἢ πόλλ' ἀγρώσαις σκαιὰ πρόσκειται φρενί*, *ib.* 107 *ἄλλῳ δ' ἄλλο πρόσκειται γέρας, | σὲ μὲν μάχεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ βουλεύειν καλῶς.* This usage is not noticed in L. and S. (H.)

In *Mélanges Gr. Rom.* VI 150 Nauck proposed *βραχεῖ δὲ μύθῳ*, but the postponement of *δέ* is normal (Eur. *Hel.* 39 n.).

103

ἀνὴρ γὰρ ὅστις ἥδεται λέγων ἀεί,
λέληθεν αὑτὸν τοῖς ξυνοῦσιν ὢν βαρύς.

103. **1** γὰρ SM: δ' A | λέγειν S

103 Stob. *flor.* 36. 16 (III p. 694, 6 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλείτῃ, 'ἀνὴρ...βαρύς.'

1 See cr. n. Although δέ is constantly corrupted to γάρ, the converse case rarely occurs: see Porson on Eur. *Med.* 1083 (1087).

2 λέληθεν αὑτὸν...ὤν. In this idiom the partic. is always nom., never acc.: contrast ξύνοιδα ἐμαυτῷ, after which either the nom. or dat. participle is legitimate, and see Kuehner-Gerth II 50.—**βαρύς,** *tiresome.* So Eur. *Suppl.* 894 οὐδ' ἐξεριστὴς τῶν λόγων, ὅθεν βαρὺς | μάλιστ' ἂν εἴη δημότης τε καὶ ξένος, Plat. *Theaet.* 210 C ἐάν τε κενὸς ᾖς, ἧττον ἕσει βαρὺς τοῖς συνοῦσι καὶ ἠμερώτερος.

H. rendered:—'The man that will be talking still forgets | That he is tedious to his company.'

104

ἀλλ' εἴπερ εἶ γενναῖος, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγεις,
σήμαιν' ὅτου τ' εἶ χὠπόθεν· τὸ γὰρ καλῶς
πεφυκὸς οὐδεὶς ἂν μιάνειεν λόγος.

104. **2** εἶ ὀπόθεν SMA, εἶ χ' ὠπόθεν B, εἶ καὶ πόθεν Gesner

104 Stob. *flor.* 88. 11 (IV p. 722, 1 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλείτῃ. 'ἀλλ'...λόγος.'

'If you really are noble, as you say, declare your parentage and your home: for good birth will not be shamed in the telling.' There can be no reason for a noble to conceal his identity,—rather the contrary: cf. Arist. fr. 91 Rose εὐγενείας μὲν οὖν φησὶν (sc. Lycophron) ἀφανὲς τὸ κάλλος, ἐν λόγῳ δὲ τὸ σεμνόν. The meaning is quite simple, and there is no need for R. Enger's conjecture λόγῳ in v. 3, still less for Wagner's ψόγος or Holzner's πότμος. The fragment is supposed to come from a dialogue between Aletes and Orestes: see Introductory Note.

1 εἴπερ. The force of this conjunction has been exhaustively examined by E. S. Thompson on Plato *Meno*, p. 258 ff. He shows that *si modo* (fr. 86 n.) is the principal, but not the only meaning, and that there are many instances in which (as here) εἴπερ *assumes the truth* of the supposition it introduces. For the present passage cf. *Ai.* 547 εἴπερ δικαίως ἔστ' ἐμὸς τὰ πατρόθεν, Plat. *Lach.* 197 C φημὶ γάρ σε εἶναι σοφόν, καὶ Λάμαχόν γε, εἴπερ ἔστε ἀνδρεῖοι. Ellendt erroneously gives *siquidem* as the equivalent of εἴπερ everywhere in Sophocles; but the examples readily refute him.

2 f. ὅτου τ' εἶ χὠπόθεν: the usual questions put to a stranger after Hom. α 170. Cf. *Phil.* 56, Eur. *Hel.* 83, *Phoen.* 123, *El.* 779, *Ion* 258.—**καλῶς πεφυκὸς:** cf. *El.* 989 ζῆν αἰσχρὸν αἰσχρῶς τοῖς καλῶς πεφυκόσιν.

105

ἀλλ' ἀξίως ἤλεγξας οὐδ' ἡμῖν πικρῶς·
γένος γὰρ εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξιὸν καλὸν
εὔκλειαν ἂν κτήσαιτο μᾶλλον ἢ ψόγον.

105. **1** ἤλεγξας Bergk: ἔλεξας codd. | οὐδ' ἡμῖν Hartung: οὐδὲ (οὐδὲν A) μὲν SMA, οὐδ' ἐμοὶ Porson, οὐδὲ μὴν Brunck, οὐδ' ἄγαν Blaydes

105 Stob. *flor.* 89. 8 (IV p. 728, 1 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλείτῃ. 'ἀλλ'...ψόγον.'

It has been often remarked that these verses appear to be a reply to the previous fragment. This consideration recommends the substitution of ἤλεγξας for ἔλεξας in v. 1 ('thy questions are justified'): the change is a small one, and the improvement substantial. The correction, which occurred to me independently, was made long ago by Bergk, but has been neglected by recent critics.—Hartung is entitled to the credit of οὐδ' ἡμῖν (see cr. n.), which was independently suggested by Nauck. Tucker proposed οὐδὲν ἐμπικρῶν, but this is less good, apart from the novelty of the form.

2 **εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξιὸν**, 'when it comes to meet the test': Eur. *Alc.* 640 ἔδειξας εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξελθὼν ὃς εἶ, Plat. *Phaedr.* 278 C εἰς ἔλεγχον ἰὼν περὶ ὧν ἔγραψε. So in Eur. *Hipp.* 1310 εἰς ἔλεγχον πεσεῖν is 'to be discovered.' But the phrase may equally well signify, 'coming to apply the test,' as in *Phil.* 98 νῦν δ' εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξιὼν ὁρῶ κτέ. And in Eur. *Her.* 73 οἱ δ' εἰς ἔλεγχον ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν πίτνων is 'one after another questioning me.' Cf. Philem. fr. 93, 3, II 507 K. The object to be tested, if expressed, is put in the genitive: *O. C.* 1297 οὔτ' εἰς ἔλεγχον χειρὸς οὐδ' ἔργου μολών. Herwerden conj. γένους...ἐξιὼν...κτήσαιο, but this leaves καλὸν unexplained (καλοῦ Blaydes). The strong compound ἐξελέγχω, often 'to lay bare another's weakness,' occurs in a similar context: Eur. *El.* 35 (ἡμῖν) πατέρων μὲν Μυκηναίων ἄπο | γεγῶσιν· οὐ δὴ τοῦτό γ' ἐξελέγχομαι, where see Keene's note.—**καλὸν**, which is used as *e.g.* in Eur. *Hipp.* 634 κηδεύσας καλοῖς | γαμβροῖσι χαίρων σῴζεται πικρὸν λέχος, must be joined with γένος. Blaydes's conjecture λόγων is unnecessary. Hense thinks that καλὸν was substituted by the anthologist for τὸ σόν.

3 **κτήσαιτο** is like ἀστεργῆ θεᾶς | ἐκτήσατ' ὀργήν *Ai.* 776.

106

τίς ἄν ποτ' ὄλβον οὐ μέγαν θείη βροτῶν
ἢ σμικρὸν ἢ τῶν μηδαμοῦ τιμωμένων;
οὐ γάρ ποτ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ἐν ταὐτῷ μένει.

106. **1** ἄν Meineke: δή codd. | οὐ scripsi: ἢ codd. | βροτῶν A: βροτοῦ SM **2** ἢ τῶν...τιμωμένων Cobet: ἢ τὸν...τιμώμενον codd., ἤτοι...τιμώμενον Heath

106 Stob. *flor.* 105. 42 (IV p. 940, 2 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀλείτης (Ἀλείτης om. S). 'τίς...μένει.'

J., who retained ἢ in v. 1 and accepted μέγ' ἄν, a proposal of Cobet, for μέγαν interpreted as follows: 'Who would count the prosperity of men as a great thing, or as a trifle, or as a thing to be utterly despised? *For* good and bad fortune are continually succeeding each other. We can never regard it as a permanent good, nor, again, as something so transitory as to be trifling; nor, lastly, can we leave it altogether out of account.' Such was also substantially the view of Gomperz (*Bruchstücke*, p. 12), but I am unable to accept it. For, if prosperity is neither great nor small nor of no account, how are we to regard it? And in what way does the instability of human affairs establish this negative result? H. was thoroughly dissatisfied with the text, and

suggested tentatively in the second line *ἢ σμικρόν· ἦν τῶν κτέ.*, or *ἔστω...τιμώμενον*, or *ἢ <οὐ> τῶν...τιμωμένων*; Blaydes makes several guesses, none of which has any probability. I believe that Cobet's attractive *μέγ' ἄν* has led to a darkening of counsel, and that what Sophocles really affirmed was that great prosperity is of little or no account because of its instability. This meaning is obtained by substituting *οὐ* for the first *ἤ* with Meineke's *ἄν* for *δή* and Cobet's alteration in v. 2. The sentiment is then exactly the same as that of fr. 593 *οὐ χρή ποτ' ἀνθρώπων μέγαν ὄλβον ἀπο- | βλέψαι· τανυφλοίου γὰρ ἰσαμέριος | <φύλλοισιν> αἰγείρου βιοτὰν ἀποβάλλει.* Cf. fr. 646, [Isocr.] 1. 42 *νόμιζε μηδὲν εἶναι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων βέβαιον· οὕτω γὰρ οὔτ' εὐτυχῶν ἔσει περιχαρὴς οὔτε δυστυχῶν περίλυπος.* In the same connexion H. refers to Eur. fr. 618 *τὸν ὄλβον οὐδὲν οὐδαμοῦ κρίνω βροτοῖς, | ὃν γ' ἐξαλείφει ῥᾷον ἢ γραφὴν θεός*, fr. 1041, Aesch. *Ag.* 1326. Although everything mundane is fleeting, a peculiar degree of insecurity was proverbially ascribed to Wealth: cf. Eur. *Hel.* 905, *Phoen.* 558 and a full list of illustrations collected by Headlam in *Journ. Phil.* XXIII 276 f. For the confusion of ΔΝ and ΔΗ see H. Richards in *C. R.* VI 338, Bywater in *J. P.* XXXII 225. It should be mentioned that Cobet, *Nov. Lect.* p. 501, while contending that *δή* has frequently been altered by scribes to *ἄν*, adds 'etiam contra peccatur *sed rarissime*.'—For **θείη...σμικρόν**, 'regard as trifling,' cf. *El.* 1270 *δαιμόνιον αὐτὸ τίθημ' ἐγώ*. For the partitive gen. forming the predicate J. quotes Plat. *rep.* 424 C *ἐμὲ...θὲς τῶν πεπεισμένων*, *id.* 437 B *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἐναντίων ἀλλήλοις θείης (ἄν)*.—**μηδαμοῦ** is not 'nowhere honoured,' but a genitive of price: 'held in no esteem,' 'valued at *nil*.' H. quotes Eur. fr. 360, 49 *Παλλὰς δ' οὐδαμοῦ τιμᾶσεται*, *O. T.* 908 *οὐδαμοῦ τιμαῖς Ἀπόλλων ἐμφανής*, Aesch. *Eum.* 627 *μητρὸς μηδαμοῦ τιμὰς νέμειν*, Menand. fr. 405 III 118 K. *τῆς μερίδος ὧν τῆς οὐδαμοῦ τεταγμένης*. So *οὐδαμοῦ λέγειν* (*Ant.* 184), *νομίζειν* (Aesch. *Pers.* 498, *Eum.* 426, Ar. *Nub.* 1421). See also on Eur. *Phoen.* 1464 *οὐδαμοῦ νίκη πέλοι*.—In regard to Heath's *ἤτοι* J. observes that *ἤ...ἤτοι* is not found in tragedy (Lobeck on *Ai.* 177), though it occurs in Hom. *τ* 599, Pind. *Nem.* 6. 4 f. On the other hand *ἤτοι...ἤ* is not uncommon: *e.g. Ant.* 1182, *Trach.* 150. Blaydes proposed *ἤ καὶ...τιμώμενον*.

3 **αὐτῶν** cannot refer to *βροτῶν* but is used vaguely in reference to *ὄλβον*, as if it were *τῶν τοιούτων*. So often in Thucydides: *e.g.* 2. 43 *τὴν τῆς πόλεως δύναμιν... ἐνθυμουμένους ὅτι τολμῶντες καὶ γιγνώσκοντες τὰ δέοντα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις αἰσχυνόμενοι ἄνδρες αὐτὰ ἐκτήσαντο*, 6. 10 *σπονδαὶ ἔσονται· οὕτω γὰρ...ἄνδρες ἔπραξαν αὐτά*. For the tendency to pluralize see Shilleto on Thuc. 1. 7. For similar instances see Adam on Plat. *Crit.* 44 C, Starkie on Ar. *Ach.* 438, and Roberts on Dion. Hal. *de comp. verb.* 14 p. 141.—**οὐδὲν ἐν ταὐτῷ μένει**: Nauck refers to Eur. *Ion* 969 *τὰ θνητὰ τοιαῦθ'· οὐδὲν ἐν ταὐτῷ μένει*. The phrase *ἐν τ. μ.* occurs also in Eur. *Tro.* 350, *Hel.* 1026, fr. 201.

107

δεινόν γε τοὺς μὲν δυσσεβεῖς κακῶν ἄπο
βλαστόντας εἶτα τούσδε μὲν πράσσειν καλῶς,

107. **1** *δεινόν γε* Gesner: *δεινὸν* S, *δεινὸν μὲν* MA, *δεινὸν δὲ* B | post *κακῶν* Bergk *τ'* inseruit **2** *βλαστῶντας* M

107 Stob. *flor.* 106. 11 (IV p. 951, 12 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἀλείτης. '*δεινόν... γεγώς*.'

It has been conjectured by F. W. Schmidt that this fragment has been wrongly attributed to Sophocles, and that it really belongs to Euripides. The moralizing tone is certainly suggestive of the latter, but the thought itself was a commonplace, and might as well have proceeded from Sophocles as from Euripides. Theognis had dwelt at length on the injustice of the divine government: see vv. 373—386, 731—752. Cf. Eur. fr. 293. There is nothing in the language which points decisively one way or the other, and the indications, such as they are, are perhaps slightly in favour of

τοὺς δ' ὄντας ἐσθλοὺς ἔκ τε γενναίων ἅμα
γεγῶτας εἶτα δυστυχεῖς πεφυκέναι.
οὐ χρῆν τάδ' οὕτω δαίμονας θνητῶν πέρι
πράσσειν· ἐχρῆν γὰρ τοὺς μὲν εὐσεβεῖς βροτῶν
ἔχειν τι κέρδος ἐμφανὲς θεῶν πάρα,
τοὺς δ' ὄντας ἀδίκους τοῖσδε τὴν ἐναντίαν
δίκην κακῶν τιμωρὸν ἐμφανῆ τίνειν·
κοὐδεὶς ἂν οὕτως ηὐτύχει κακὸς γεγώς.

5 χρῆν S: χρῇ M, χρὴ A **6** τάσσειν Gomperz **8** τοῖσδε A: τούσδε S, τοὺς δὲ M | τὴν ἐπαξίαν Herwerden **10** ηὐτύχει Heath: εὐτύχει Trinc., εὐτυχεῖ S, εὐτυχῆ εἰ M, εὐτυχῆ A

Sophocles. See also Introductory Note.

1 f. δεινόν γε. It is highly probable that this is the opening line of a speech, and that γε has its usual connective force: 'Ah! it is sad....' See Neil on Ar. *Eq.*, p. 188 and cf. *El.* 341 δεινόν γέ σ' οὖσαν πατρὸς οὐ σὺ παῖς ἔφυς | κείνου λελῆσθαι, Ar. *Av.* 1269 δεινόν γε τὸν κήρυκα τὸν παρὰ τοὺς βροτοὺς | οἰχόμενον εἰ μηδέποτε νοστήσει πάλιν. Sometimes the effect of γε is to throw a stronger emphasis on the adjective than in the instances just cited: see Jebb on *Phil.* 1225.—The addition of τ' (see cr. n.) after κακῶν has met with general approval, but I believe it can be shown to be unnecessary, if not actually harmful. Presumably those who accept τ' regard δυσσεβεῖς and κακῶν ἄπο βλαστόντας as co-ordinate, and the whole phrase as controlled by the articular τοὺς. But the consequence, though this has not been observed, is to make εἶτα solecistic; for, though Sophocles frequently employs εἶτα with resumptive force after a participle (v. Ellendt s.v.), he could not do so where the participle is attributive and not circumstantial. The fact is that τοὺς μὲν should be taken alone, = *some*) (τοὺς δ' = *others*; and δυσσεβεῖς coalesces with βλαστόντας as part of the predicate. Cf. *El.* 440, 1081, where βλαστάνω is little more than a copula. It is stronger here and in the precisely parallel *Ai.* 1304 ἄριστος ἐξ ἀριστέοιν δυοῖν βλαστών, *i.e.* 'born as the impious children of wicked parents.' Of course even so the connective particle might have been used, as in *El.* 590 εὐσεβεῖς κἀξ εὐσεβῶν βλαστόντας, but it is unnecessary to introduce it.—**τουσδε** resumes τοὺς μὲν with a certain rhetorical impressiveness. Cf. *Trach.* 819 τὴν δὲ τέρψιν ἣν | τὠμῷ δίδωσι πατρί, τηνδ' αὐτὴ λάβοι and Tr. fr. adesp. 78. The examples with νιν and αὐτοῖς (*O. T.* 248, 270, *Trach.* 287) are less emphatic. See also n. on Eur. *Phoen.* 498, Kuehner-Gerth 1 660, Maetzner on Lycurg. 27.

3 ἅμα is suspected by Nauck, but I can see no more objection to it here than *e.g.* in *Ai.* 1008 σὸς πατὴρ ἐμός θ' ἅμα — **ἐκ** is used indifferently with ἄπο in v. 1. For the ordinary distinction see Jebb on *Ant.* 192.

6 πράσσειν (see cr. n.) is used of divine action in *El.* 200 εἴτ' οὖν θεὸς εἴτε βροτῶν | ἦν ὁ ταῦτα πράσσων and in *Trach.* 1267 μεγάλην δὲ θεοῖς ἀγνωμοσύνην | εἰδότες ἔργων τῶν πρασσομένων. Its occurrence in another sense above is not a serious objection.—**ἐχρῆν**: the augmented form occurs only here in Sophocles: see Jebb on *Phil.* 1061.

7 ἐμφανές: a favourite word in Sophocles, who uses it 14 times as against 8 occurrences in Euripides.

8 τοῖσδε. I have accepted this reading with Dindorf. Nauck adopts τούσδε and inclines towards Herwerden's ἐπαξίαν (see cr. n.).

9 δίκην κακῶν τιμωρόν. The adj. is generally applied to persons, but is an epithet of δίκη in Eur. *El.* 676 δὸς δῆτα πατρὸς τοῖσδε τιμωρὸν δίκην, as well as in Plat. *legg.* 716 A, 872 E.

ΑΛΚΜΕΩΝ

There is no doubt that the correct form of the name in classical times was Ἀλκμέων rather than Ἀλκμαίων, as can be proved from the inscriptions both on stone and on vases: see the evidence quoted by Meisterhans[3] p. 35.

Alcmaeon was one of the stock heroes of tragedy (Arist. *poet.* 13. 1453[a] 20), and is represented as the typical madman: cf. Timocles fr. 6 (II 453 K.), 8 *τοὺς γὰρ τραγῳδοὺς πρῶτον, εἰ βούλει, σκόπει | ὡς ὠφελοῦσι πάντας...ὁ νοσῶν δὲ μανικῶς Ἀλκμέων' ἐσκέψατο.* There are two considerations which enable us to narrow the enquiry relating to the contents of the plot: (1) the fact that Sophocles also wrote plays[1] entitled Ἐπίγονοι and Ἐριφύλη; (2) fr. 108 shows that Alcmaeon had not yet recovered his reason. We may safely infer that the events on which the play is based were subsequent to the death of Eriphyle, while her son was still pursued by the Erinyes of his mother, and before he was finally released from suffering. Welcker (p. 279), who with high probability refers fr. 880 to the prologue of this play, builds on it a reconstructed plot with greater confidence than the facts warrant. Nevertheless, if we examine the legends with which Alcmaeon is connected, and exclude for the reason already given his revenge on his mother for his father's death, and his share in the expedition of the Epigoni, as well as the Corinthian episode dramatized by Euripides in his Ἀλκμέων διὰ Κορίνθου (*TGF* p. 379) as being entirely disconnected from the healing of the hero's madness, we are forced to conclude that Sophocles must have utilized either the adventures at Psophis or those in Acarnania[2]. If we admit the relevance of fr. 880, only one answer is possible; but, even apart from that, there can be but little doubt as to the higher dramatic value of the Psophis-story, which Euripides also treated. It is conjectured but not proved that it was contained in the epic *Thebais*, or rather in the *Epigoni*, which is now regarded not so much as a separate poem as a subdivision of the *Thebais* (Bethe, *Theb. Heldenlieder*, p. 137). Our principal sources of information are Pausan. 8. 24. 8 ff. and Apollod. 3. 87 ff.[3]. From them we learn that

[1] Or a play entitled *Epigoni* containing the story of Eriphyle: see Introd. to *Epigoni*, p. 129.

[2] So also Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.* p. 501, for similar reasons.

[3] Ovid (*Met.* 9. 409 ff.) refers briefly to the story, as if the details were familiar: *attonitusque malis, exul mentisque domusque, | vultibus Eumenidum matrisque*

Alcmaeon, pursued by the avenging spirit of his mother, came to Psophis in Arcadia, where Phegeus the king purified him and gave him his daughter Alphesiboea (Arsinoe, according to Apollod.) to wife. Alcmaeon gave to her the famous necklace and robe of Harmonia. His madness, however, was not allayed, and Alcmaeon was commanded by the Delphic oracle to settle in a new land which had been left dry by the sea since the pollution of the murder. Accordingly he went to the delta of the Achelous, where new land was continually being formed by the silting of the river; and there he settled and married Callirrhoe, the daughter of the river-god. But his new wife sighed for the necklace and would not be comforted, until Alcmaeon promised to return to Psophis and fetch it for her. Arriving at Psophis, he pretended to Phegeus that the oracle required the dedication of the necklace at Delphi as a condition of his release from the madness[1]; Phegeus believed the story and handed it over. One of Alcmaeon's attendants, however, betrayed the secret about Callirrhoe, with the result that he was waylaid and killed by the sons of Phegeus at their father's bidding. To Propertius (I. 15. 15) we owe a dramatic touch which does not appear in the other authorities,—although Apollodorus gives a hint of Arsinoe's disagreement with her brothers: *Alphesiboea suos ulta est pro coniuge fratres, | sanguinis et cari vincula rupit amor*[2]. Perhaps then, as Welcker suggests, Alcmaeon was given a more creditable rôle than is indicated by the account of Apollodorus. It may be added that fr. 108 exactly fits the situation, if we suppose it spoken by Phegeus or Alphesiboea in answer to Alcmaeon's request for the necklace, when he alleged that it was required for the god. If the right view has been taken above, it is clear that Valckenaer (*Diatr.* p. 150) was wrong in referring Tr. fr. adesp. 358 to this play. If written by Sophocles at all, the verses belong rather to the *Epigoni*, as Ribbeck (p. 495) thought[3].

agitabitur umbris, | donec eum coniunx fatale reposcerit aurum, | cognatumque latus Phegeus hauserit ensis. He goes on to describe the prayer of Callirrhoe that her sons might be immediately brought to manhood, in order to avenge their father's murder. The sequel is related by Apollodorus, but is hardly relevant to the play of Sophocles.

[1] Cf. Athen. 232 F, where the oracle is given.

[2] The other authorities, as we have seen, make Callirrhoe the avenger of Alcmaeon's death. Unfortunately little or nothing is known of the *Alcmaeon* and *Alphesiboea* of Accius. Nevertheless, Welcker and Ahrens have endeavoured to reconstruct the plot of Sophocles from his fragments, concluding (*e.g.*) from *Alphes.* fr. IX *sed angustate inclusam ac saxis, squalidam* that Alphesiboea was imprisoned by her brothers in order to prevent her from avenging Alcmaeon's death.

[3] *Inf.* p. 131.

108

εἴθ' εὖ φρονήσαντ' εἰσίδοιμί πως φρενῶν ἐπήβολον καλῶν σε.

108 Porphyr. *qu. Hom.* 1 τὸ δὲ *ἐπήβολος σημαίνει τὸν ἐπιτυχῆ καὶ ἐγκρατῆ ἀπὸ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τοῦ βάλλειν...Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλκμαίωνι. 'εἴθ'...σε.'* Eustath. *Od.* p. 1448, 6 *ἐπήβολος δὲ οὐ ποιητικὴ* (*i.e.* Homeric) *λέξις, ἀλλὰ Ἀττικὴ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, οἳ καὶ προφέρουσι. Σοφοκλῆς 'εἴθ'...σε.'* Nauck remarks that the present passage may also be referred to by Eustath. *Il.* p. 625, 38 *οὕτω δὲ καὶ 'φρενῶν ἐπήβολος.'*

'Would that I might see thee, with thy wits restored, the master of a clear brain.' The reading has been much canvassed, and Campbell condemns the 'unmeaning tautology' of the text. Thus Cobet ejected *εὖ φρονήσαντ'* as a gloss, Ribbeck corrected it to *εὐτυχήσαντ'*, F. W. Schmidt to *οὐ φρονήσαντ'*, Wecklein to *ἀφρονήσαντ'*, Gomperz to *εὖ φρονήσαις*, and Nauck (in his earlier edition) to *εὖ φρενώσαντ'*. It is perhaps presumptuous to ignore such a chorus of suspicion, but the text does not seem to me, if fairly interpreted, to be in any way abnormal. It should be observed (1) that *εὖ φρονήσαντ'* is ingressive, as in Plat. *Phaedr.* 231 D *πῶς ἂν εὖ φρονήσαντες ταῦτα καλῶς ἔχειν ἠγήσαιντο;* so *φρονήσας* in *O. T.* 649 (Jebb's n.). Mekler adds Eur. *Bacch.* 1259. (2) that *ἐπήβολον* (*ὄντα*), and not *εὖ φρονήσαντ'* (=*ὅταν εὖ φρονήσῃς*), is dependent on *εἰσίδοιμι*: for the omission of *ὤν* as a supplementary participle see Eur. *Hclid.* 332, *Phoen.* 1163, *Her.* 516, Goodw. § 911, Starkie on Ar. *Vesp.* 1526. There is thus no necessity for Dindorf's *καὶ* in place of *πως*, or Mekler's *τ'* after *φρενῶν*. So far as the redundancy of expression is concerned, it is hardly more remarkable than in *Ant.* 492 *λυσσῶσαν αὐτὴν οὐδ' ἐπήβολον φρενῶν*. Sophocles may have taken this touch from Herodotus: see 3. 25 *οἷα δὲ ἐμμανής τε ἐὼν καὶ οὐ φρενήρης*, 35 *παραφρονέειν καὶ οὐκ εἶναι νοήμονα*. See also on fr. 28, Jebb on *O. T.* 58. For the word *ἐπήβολος* see Jebb on *Ant.* l. c. and Blomfield gloss. to Aesch. *Prom.* 452 (460). The form (for *ἐπίβολος*) is supposed to be due to metrical lengthening: Giles, *Manual of Comp. Phil.* § 220. Cf. *παραίβολος, καταιβάτης, κατηβολή* (Eur. fr. 614).—For **φρενῶν καλῶν** cf. Eur. fr. 548 *τί τῆς εὐμορφίας | ὄφελος, ὅταν τις μὴ φρέναs καλὰς ἔχῃ.*

109

αἰνῶ

109 Hesych. 1 p. 81 *αἰνῶ· παρίημι, παραιτοῦμαι. καὶ ἐπαινῶ. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλκμαίωνι* (corrected by M. Schmidt for cod. *ἀλμαίωνι*). Bekk. *anecd.* p. 358, 28 and Suid. *αἰνῶ· παραιτοῦμαι. Σοφοκλῆς. καὶ ἐπαινῶ.* Suid. adds to this *καὶ αἰνῶ σε.* Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 55, 5 *αἰνῶ· παραιτοῦμαι καὶ ἐπαινῶ. Σοφοκλῆς.* It is more usual to find *ἐπαινῶ* in the sense of a polite refusal: Ar. *Ran.* 508 *κάλλιστ', ἐπαινῶ*, which is equivalent to the Latin *bene vocas: tam gratiast* (Plaut. *Men.* 387). In *Phil.* 889 *αἰνῶ τάδ', ὦ παῖ, καί μ' ἔπαιρ' ὥσπερ νοεῖς*, as may be the case with our 'thank you,' the words accompany an assent. On that passage Jebb refers to Hes. *Op.* 643 (quoted on fr. 28), which the scholl. explain by *παραιτεῖσθαι*, as does Plut. *poet. aud.* 6 p. 22 F.

110

ἀραίας

110 Hesych. 1 p. 269 *ἀραίας· βλαβερᾶς. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀλκμαίωνι* (so Musurus for *ἀλκμαί* cod.).

Cf. *Etym. M.* p. 134, 14 *ἡ παρὰ τὸ ἄρεος, βλαπτικοῦ ὄντος, ἀρὰ ἡ βλαβή· καὶ ἀραῖα βίαια, δεινά, χαλεπά, ὀδυνηρά.*

ἀραῖος, meaning *fraught with a curse*, has a double aspect like *προστρόπαιος* (see my ed. of Eur. *Heraclidae*, p. 148),

ἀλαστωρ, παλαμναῖος. For the meaning *dangerous*, *i.e.* bringing a curse upon others, cf. *O. T.* 1291 μενῶν δόμοισι ἀραῖος, *Trach.* 1202 καὶ νέρθεν ὢν ἀραῖος εἰσαεὶ βαρύς, Aesch. *Ag.* 247 φθόγγον ἀραῖον οἴκοις, Eur. *I. T.* 778 ἢ σοῖς ἀραία δώμασιν γενήσομαι, *Hipp.* 1415 εἰθ' ἦν ἀραῖον δαίμοσιν βροτῶν γένος, *Med.* 608 καὶ σοῖς ἀραία γ' οὖσα τυγχάνω δόμοις. See also on fr. 399. The sinner and his victim are both ἀραῖοι as implicated in ἀρά, and possible sources of pollution: the so-called 'active' and 'passive' senses of the adj. have a common starting-point.

ΑΜΥΚΟΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΙΚΟΣ

This play related to an incident which happened on the outward voyage of the Argonauts and is recounted among the feats of Polydeuces. Amycus, the inhospitable king of the Bebrycians in Bithynia, used to forbid all strangers to land on his coast and fetch water for their ships, until they had fought a boxing-match with him. Hitherto he had always killed his opponents, but when the Argonauts arrived he met his conqueror in Polydeuces (Apollod. 1. 119, Hygin. *fab.* 17). The boxing-match is described by Apoll. Rhod. 2. 1—97 and Theocr. 22. 27—134. Whether these writers took any hints from Sophocles it is impossible to say, but one point in which they differ is deserving of notice. According to Apollonius, with whom most of the other authorities agree, Amycus was killed by Polydeuces; but Theocritus (131 ff.) represents Polydeuces as sparing his life, and merely requiring him to swear an oath by his father Poseidon never to maltreat strangers in the future. Similarly, according to schol. Ap. Rhod. 2. 98, both Epicharmus (fr. 7 K.) and Periander stated that he was put in chains. Such an ending was more suitable to a satyr-play. We may conjecture that the satyrs were his slaves, and were liberated after the defeat of their master[1].

III

γέρανοι, χελῶναι, γλαῦκες, ἰκτῖνοι, λαγοί

111 Athen. 400 B τῇ δὲ τὸν λαγὸν ἐνιεὶ αἰτιατικῇ ἀκόλουθός ἐστιν ἡ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἀμύκῳ σατυρικῷ πληθυντικὴ ὀνομαστική· 'γέρανοι λαγοί' (C) οὕτως δ' ἐχρήσατο τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος (fr. 60 Kaibel) καὶ Ἡρόδοτος καὶ ὁ τοὺς Εἴλωτας ποιήσας. εἰπὰ ἐστι τὸ μὲν Ἰακὸν λαγώς (Amipsias fr. 18 [675 K.])· 'λαγὼς παράξας πῖδι τὸν θαλάσσιον,' τὸ δὲ λαγὼς Ἀττικόν. Λάγωσι δὲ καὶ Ἀττικοὶ λάγοι, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς· 'γέρανοι, κορῶναι, γλαῦκες, ἰκτῖνοι, λαγώ.' Gramm. Herm. p. 320 = Cramer *anecd. Par.* IV p. 248, 24 τὸ μὲν λαγώς...εὕρηται παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ 'γλαῦκες, ἰκτῖνοι (ἰκτῖς καὶ *anecd. Par.*), λαγοί.' Eustath. *Od.* p. 1534, 18 quotes from Athenaeus, giving as from Sophocles the words 'γλαῦκες, ἰκτῖνες, λαγοί.'

[1] See Introductory Note to the *Ichneutae*.

Whether *κορῶναι* in the second quotation of Athenaeus is a mistake for *χελῶναι*, or vice versa, and in what connexion this strange list was cited, it does not seem possible to determine.

λαγοί is the plural of the Ionic λαγός, answering to the Attic λαγώς. The fact that it appeared in tragedy does not, of course, justify its use in ordinary Attic (Rutherford, *New Phryn.* p. 273). Phrynichus says: λαγώς, ὁ Ἀττικός. διὰ δὲ τοῦ ō ὁ Ἴων (p. 186 Lob.). See Weir Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, § 478, *K. Z.* XXIX 109. The nom. λαγός is evidenced by the acc. plur. λαγός in Hes. *Scut.* 302 *τοὶ δ' ὠκύποδας λαγὸς ἤρευν | ἄνδρες θηρευταί.* Meineke thought that Sophocles must have written λαγῴ.

112

σιαγόνας τε δὴ μαλθακὰς τίθησι

112 Athen. 94 E *σιαγόνος δὲ Κρατῖνος...καὶ Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμύκῳ· 'σιαγόνας... τίθησι.'* Porson proposed to make an iambic trimeter by placing *δή* after *τίθησι*; and *δή* in this position and with temporal meaning occurs in *Trach.* 460, *Phil.* 1065, and elsewhere (Eur. *Hel.* 134 n.). Mekler thought that the metre might be trochaic tetrameter. Blaydes preferred the order *τίθησι μαλθακάς*, with *σου* for *δή*. H., however, suggests that *μαλθακὰς τίθησι* is an ithyphallic following a trimeter, as in Aesch. *Prom.* 610 *γεγυμνάκασιν, οὐδ' ἔχω μαθεῖν ὅπῃ | πτημονὰς ἀλύξω.* The words clearly describe the punishment inflicted by one pugilist upon another. H. quotes Herond. 8. 8 *μέχρι σευ παραστᾶσα | τὸ βρέγμα τῷ σκίπωνι μαλθακὸν θῶμαι.* Com. fr. adesp. 125 (III 432 K.) *ἂν μὴ ποιήσω πέπονα μαστιγῶν ὅλον, | ἂν μὴ ποιήσω σπογγιᾶς μαλακώτερον | τὸ πρόσωπον.* Plaut. *Aul.* 422 *ita fustibus sum mollior magis quam ullus cinaedus.* Add Plaut. *Mil.* 1424 *mitis sum equidem fustibus,* Ter. *Eun.* 1028 *utinam tibi commitigari videam sandalio caput.* So perhaps μαλάξῃς in Ar. *Eq.* 389.

ΑΜΦΙΑΡΕΩΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΙΚΟΣ

Tragedies bearing the title *Amphiaraus* were composed by Carcinus (*TGF* p. 797) and Cleophon (Suid.), as well as comedies by Aristophanes, Plato, Apollodorus of Carystus, and Philippides (Kock I 396, 604, III 280, 302).

It is difficult to guess which part of Amphiaraus' story was suitable for a satyr-play. A suggestion has been made in the note on fr. 113, but there is no other evidence to confirm or rebut it, and the words of the fragment itself are exceptionally obscure. An alternative subject, which has perhaps more claim to consideration on general grounds, would be the part taken by Amphiaraus in the events which led to the founding of the Nemean games. In that case the plot would cover the same ground as the *Nemea* of Aeschylus (*TGF* p. 49) and the *Hypsipyle* of Euripides (*Ox. Pap.* VI p. 21 ff.). The story of the death of the child Opheltes or Archemorus, in whose honour the games were founded, is told practically in the same form by Apollod. 3. 64—66 and Hygin. *fab.* 74. The locality, a remote fountain guarded by a dragon, was especially suitable to a satyr-play; and the subject was clearly capable of lighter handling than the fortunes of Amphiaraus at Argos or at Thebes.

113

ὁ πινοτήρης τοῦδε μάντεως χορός

113 πιννοτήρης cod.: corr. Dindorf | χορός Meineke: χοροῦ cod.

113 Schol. V Ar. *Vesp.* 1510 πιννοτήρης...καρκίνιόν τί ἐστι σύννομον καὶ ἀεὶ ταύτῃ προσεχόμενον (προσδεχόμενον cod.). Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμφιαράῳ 'ὁ πιννοτήρης...χοροῦ.'

The fabulous story of the πινοτήρης is several times referred to, but not always told in the same way. According to Plut. *de coll. an.* 30 p. 980 A it caused Chrysippus to waste a great deal of ink,—because it provided him with an excellent illustration of πρόνοια. His account is preserved by Athen. 89 D (II 729 a Arn.), quoted from the 5th book of the treatise περὶ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς: ἡ πίννη, φησί, καὶ ὁ πιννοτήρης συνεργὰ ἀλλήλοις, κατ' ἰδίαν οὐ δυνάμενα συμμένειν. ἡ μὲν οὖν πίννη ὄστρεόν ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ πιννοτήρης καρκίνος μικρός. καὶ ἡ πίννη διαστήσασα τὸ ὄστρακον ἡσυχάζει τηροῦσα τὰ ἐπεισιόντα ἰχθύδια, ὁ δὲ πιννοτήρης παρεστώς, ὅταν εἰσέλθῃ τι, δάκνει αὐτήν, ὥσπερ σημαίνων, ἡ δὲ δηχθεῖσα συμμύει· καὶ οὕτως τὸ ἀποληφθὲν ἔνδον κατεσθίουσι κοινῇ. Cic. *n. d.* 2. 123 no doubt comes ultimately from Chrysippus; and there are other authorities to the same effect. But in Cic. *fin.* 3. 63 *at illa, quae in concha patula pina dicitur, isque, qui enat e concha, qui, quod eam custodit, pinoteres vocatur, in eandemque cum se recepit, includitur, ut videatur monuisse, ut caveret...aliorum etiam causa quaedam faciunt*, the pea-crab does not assist the bivalve to obtain nourishment, but warns it against approaching danger; and this is the version given in a letter to Linnaeus, quoted by Mayor (on *n. d.* l.c.) from the *English Cyclopaedia*, which is of particular interest as showing that in the middle of the 18th century the Levantine Greeks continued to regale strangers with the same fable to which their ancestors had given currency more than 2000 years before. Modern science recognizes the fact that the pea-crab habitually resides in the shell of the pinna, but does not countenance the rest of the story. It remains to ascertain how Sophocles made the allusion relevant. Ellendt, who is followed by Campbell (keeping χοροῦ), absurdly supposes that a number of μάντεις appeared in the play, and that the shortest of them by a ridiculous comparison was called πιννοτήρης. So L. and S. interpret *a little parasitical fellow*. But there is not the slightest reason to suppose that Aristophanes was parodying Sophocles, although, when the comic poet says of the sons of Carcinus (*the Crab*) 'here's the πινοτήρης of the family,' it is not difficult to infer that the 'baby-crab' is meant. There was no Carcinus in Sophocles, and, as we can hardly refer τοῦδε μάντεως to anyone but Amphiaraus, it seems likely that Meineke was right in restoring χορός for χοροῦ. Even then the point of the allusion is obscure; but the only situation in the story of Amphiaraus, so far as it is known to us, which might possibly account for it, and would at the same time be suitable for treatment in a satyr-play, is the incident related by Hygin. *fab.* 73 (cf. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 6. 445, *Myth. Vat.* 1 152), how that Amphiaraus, knowing that he would perish at Thebes, concealed himself from Adrastus and the rest with the connivance of Eriphyle, and was subsequently discovered in consequence of the treachery of his wife, who was bribed by her brother with a golden necklace. According to Stat. *Theb.* 3. 570 ff. (cf. 606, 619), Amphiaraus hid himself in his house, and refused to tell the result of his divination. May we suppose that in such circumstances the satyr-chorus was posted outside in order to give timely warning to the seer of the approach of danger? Welcker (*Nachtr.* p. 318) also conjectured on the strength of this fragment that the satyrs were taken by Amphiaraus into his service as attendants in the rites of divination. Bergk thought that a crowd following at the heels of the seer was meant, and that Tiresias was the seer in question.

114

ἔνθ' οὔτε πέλλεις οἷ ἄγραυλος βότος

114 Cramer *anecd. Oxon.* I p. 344, 8 *πολιοῖο· οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν τὴν ἀκριβῆ γραφὴν 'πελιοῖο.'...πελιοῦ οὖν παρὰ τὸ πέλλω* (πελλός Schneidewin)· *'ἔνθ'...βότος.' Σοφοκλῆς ἐν 'Αμφιαράῳ σατυρικῷ.* For Erotian *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 109, 7, which appears to quote the word *πελλός* as occurring in this play, see on fr. 509.

The text is desperately corrupt. Lobeck elicited from it *ἐνθοῦ τε πέλλης οἷος ἄγραυλον βοτόν*, and from him Nauck adopts *πελλῆς οἷος*, leaving the other words untouched. *βότος*, for which Cramer substituted *βοτήρ*, is anyhow corrupt. Schneidewin preferred *ἐνδύντα πελλῆς ῥινὸν ἀγραύλου βοός*, which Dindorf approved with the exception that he proposed *ἐνδύς τε* in place of *ἐνδύντα*. For *πελλός* (or *πέλλος*) see on fr. 509. *ἀγραύλοιο βοός* in Hom. Ω 81 (cf. M 252) perhaps lends some support to Schneidewin's correction of the last two words.

115

ἔτ' αὖ...ὥσπερ ἀλιεὺς πληγεὶς... <φρ> ενῶν διδάσκαλος

115 *φρενῶν* restituit E. A. I. Ahrens

115 Schol. Plat. *Symp.* 222 B *ὁ ἀλιεὺς πληγεὶς νοῦν φύσει. φασὶ γὰρ ἁλιέα ἀγκιστρεύοντα, ἐπειδὰν σπάσῃ τῷ λίνῳ τὸν ἰχθύν, τῇ χειρὶ προσαγαγόντα κατέχειν, ἵνα μὴ φύγῃ· τοῦτο δὲ συνήθως ποιοῦντα ὑπὸ σκορπίου πληγῆναι καὶ εἰπεῖν* (vulgo εἶπε) *'πληγεὶς νοῦν φύσεις,' καὶ μηκέτι προσάγειν ἐξ ἐκείνου τὴν χεῖρα. κέχρηται τῇ παροιμίᾳ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν 'Αμφιαράῳ σατυρικῷ λέγων 'ἔτ' αὖ...ὥσπερ ἁλιεὺς πληγεὶς ...ενῶν διδάσκαλος.'* Zenob. 2. 14 (Miller, *Mélanges de litt. gr.* p. 371) *ἁλιεὺς πληγεὶς νοῦν οἶσει* (an *φύσει*?)*...μέμνηται αὐτῆς Σοφοκλῆς.*

This is the Greek equivalent for our 'once bit, twice shy,' and is one of the many proverbs which attest the value of a hard experience. Plato, whose words are *κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν, ὥσπερ νήπιον παθόντα γνῶναι*, is referring to Hom. P 32 *ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω* or Hes. *Op.* 216 *παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω*. See also schol. Aristid. III 681 Dind. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 186 *τὸν φρονεῖν βροτοὺς ὁδώ- | σαντα, τὸν πάθει μάθος | θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν, Eum.* 524 *ξυμφέρει σωφρονεῖν ὑπὸ στένει.*

Of the attempts which have been made to supply the missing words, the best is Headlam's: *εἰσαῦθις [ὥσπερ] ἁλιεὺς <εἰσο- μαι> πληγεὶς <φρονεῖν· | ἡμπειρία γὰρ τῶν φρ>ενῶν διδάσκαλος.* Here the second line at any rate fits admirably with the requirements of the case. It is of course possible that *ὥσπερ* is a gloss, but the first line might also run: *εἰσαῦθις ἁλιεὺς ὡσπερεὶ πληγεὶς φρονῶ.* Kock suggested: *σύ γ' ὥσπερ ἁλιεὺς σκορπίου πληγεὶς ὕπο | πολλοῖς γενήσει κτέ.*

116

ἁγνίσαι

116 Hesych. I p. 26 *ἁγνίσαι* (*ἁγνῆσαι* cod.)· *ἀποθῦσαι. Βουσίριδι* (*i.e.* Eur. fr. 314). *καὶ διαφθεῖραι. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν 'Αμφιαράῳ.* Bekk. *anecd.* p. 339, 8 *ἁγνίσαι· τὸ θῦσαι, διαφθεῖραι, κατ' ἀντίφρασιν. οὕτω Σοφοκλῆς.* To the same effect Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 19, 17. For *ἀντίφρασις*, which is sometimes entitled *εὐφημισμός*, see Rutherford, *Annotation*, p. 270.

ἁγνίσαι, 'to consecrate,' may sometimes involve destruction, as in the sacrifice of a victim. The best parallel is Eur. *I. T.* 705 *ἀμφὶ βωμὸν ἁγνισθεὶς φόνῳ*, of Orestes supposed to be sacrificed at Tauri. Cf. *Suppl.* 1211 *σώμαθ' ἡγνίσθη πυρί*. So Headlam explained *A. P.* 7. 49 (Bianor's epitaph on Euripides) *ἥγνισε τὰν θνατὰν σάματος ἰστορίην*, *i.e.* destroyed the inscription which described Euripides as mortal (*C. R.* XVI 438). See also *Ant.* 1081 *κύνες καθήγνισαν* with Jebb's n. Blaydes would prefer *ἁγίσαι*, and *καθήγισαν* in *Ant.* l.c.

117

ἀλεξαίθριον

117 Hesych. 1 p. 117 ἀλεξαίθριον· θερμὸν σκέπασμα. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμφιαράῳ. The word was doubtless modelled on the Homeric ἀλεξάνεμος: see on fr. 1112 χειμάμνα. The latter part of the compound suggests the cold of a clear frosty night: cf. fr. 149. 3 πάγου φανέντος αἰθρίου, *Ant.* 358 δυσαύλων πάγων ἐναίθρεια ...βέλη, Aesch. *Ag.* 347 τῶν ὑπαιθρίων πάγων. Blaydes needlessly conjectured ἀλέξαιθρον.

118

τρασιά

118 Zonar. *lex.* p. 1742 τρασίαι· ὁ τόπος ἔνθα τὰ σῦκα ξηραίνεται, παρὰ τὸ τερσαίνειν τὸ ξηραίνειν. ὁ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τῷ σατυρικῷ (ἑτέρῳ cod.) Ἀμφιαράῳ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλω τέθεικε τὴν λέξιν. The same extract occurs in schol. Ael. *nat. an.* 3. 10 with the variants τρασιά (which is right) παρὰ τοῦ τρασαίνειν for παρὰ τὸ τερσαίνειν, and the omission of τῷ σατυρικῷ.

τρασιά is rightly explained as a *drying-place*, but Sophocles is the only authority quoted who used the word for a *threshing-floor*. The name is suitable, as a dry spot exposed to the wind was selected for threshing: see the commentators on Verg. *Georg.* 1. 178. τρασιά is particularly applied to the drying of figs. Aelian *l.c.* relates of the hedgehog: ἑαυτὸν ἐν ταῖς τρασιαῖς κυλίει καὶ τῶν ἰσχάδων τὰς περιπαρείσας, αἱ πολλαὶ ἐμπήγνυνται ταῖς ἀκάνθαις, ἡσυχῇ κομίζει κτέ. Suid. *s. v.* also speaks of the drying of cheeses.

119

φρονεῖν

119 Erotian testifies that φρονεῖν was used by Sophocles in this play with the sense of νοεῖν: see fr. 91.

120

ὡρακιᾶσαι

120 Schol. Ar. *Kan.* 481 ὡρακιᾶσαι δέ λέγεται τὸ ὑπὸ φόβου ὠχριᾶσαι· ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν ὥραν αἰκίζειν. τοῦτο δὲ Σοφοκλῆς εἶπεν ἐν Ἀμφιαράῳ σατυρικῷ. τὸ ὠχριᾶσαι θλιβομένης τῆς καρδίας· τοῦτο δὲ πολλαχοῦ γίγνεται. The word occurs twice in Aristophanes (*Kan.* 481, *Pax.* 702) in the sense of *to faint away*. Hence Moeris p. 214, 21 ὡρακιᾶν Ἀττικῶς, Λειποψυχεῖν Ἕλληνικῶς. The origin of this obscure word is unknown. The ancients gave two explanations of it: (1) as a by-form of ὠχριᾶν; and (2) as derived from ὥραν αἰκίζειν. The former was the Alexandrian view, as we learn from the scholiast on the *Pax*, who says that Eratosthenes, dissenting from Lycophron, held that ὡρακιᾶν was not strictly the pallor, but the antecedent dizziness arising from faintness. Fritzsche thought that the scholiast attributed to Sophocles the form ὡρακίζειν, which must have fallen out before the explanation ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν ὥραν αἰκίζειν. He supports his view by *Etym. M.* p. 833, 33 ὡρακίζω, παρὰ τὸ αἰκίζεσθαι τὴν ὥραν.

121

[Σοφοκλῆς τὰ γράμματα παράγει ὀρχούμενον]

121 Athen. 454 F, after quoting certain passages in which an illiterate person is introduced giving a description of the letters composing a particular word, and amongst them the well-known fragment of Euripides (fr. 382), proceeds: καὶ Σοφοκλῆς δὲ τούτῳ παραπλήσιον ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἀμφιαράῳ σατυρικῷ τὰ γράμματα παράγων ὀρχούμενον.

The expressive character of Greek dancing is abundantly warranted; it was above all the demonstration of an idea. Lucian *de salt.* 69 καὶ γὰρ διανοίας ἐπίδειξιν τὰ γιγνόμενα ἔχει, καὶ σωματικῆς ἀσκήσεως ἐνέργειαν. Plat. *legg.* 816 A διὸ μίμησις τῶν λεγομένων σχήμασι γενομένη τὴν ὀρχηστικὴν ἐξειργάσατο τέχνην ξύμπασαν. Plutarch (*qu. conv.* 9. 15) divides dancing into φορά, σχῆμα, and δεῖξις, and says of the second (p. 747 C): ὅταν...σχῆμα διαθέντες ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος γραφικῶς τοῖς εἴδεσιν ἐπιμένωσι. *ibid.* p. 748 A ποίησιν γὰρ εἶναι τὴν ὄρχησιν σιωπῶσαν, καὶ φθεγγομένην ὄρχησιν πάλιν τὴν ποίησιν. Lucian *de salt.* 63, Demetrius said to a dancer: ἀκούω ἃ ποιεῖς, οὐχ ὁρῶ μόνον, ἀλλά μοι δοκεῖς ταῖς χερσὶν αὐταῖς λαλεῖν. Athen. 22 A: Telestes, the dancer of Aeschylus, was so skilful, that, when dancing the *Seven against Thebes*, he expressed the whole plot by his art.

ΑΜΦΙΤΡΥΩΝ

Euripides wrote an *Alcmena*, about which we have better information than has been preserved concerning the *Amphitryon* of Sophocles; for scholars are agreed that the chief dramatic innovation introduced by Euripides was that Amphitryon punished Alcmena for her supposed unfaithfulness by burning her on a funeral-pyre, and that only the timely intervention of Zeus rescued her from destruction: see Nauck, *TGF* p. 386, Wilamowitz, *Eur. Herakl.*[2] I p. 54. Wernicke (in Pauly-Wissowa I 1573) infers that Sophocles followed the earlier version recorded by Apollod. 2. 61, according to which the deception practised by Zeus and his intercourse with Alcmena were made known to Amphitryon through the agency of Tiresias. The old guess that the *Amphitryon* was a satyr-play (Osann in *Rh. Mus.* II 312) has nothing in its favour, unless indeed Porson's view of fr. 1127 is adopted. Accius wrote an *Amphitryon*, which is thought to have been adapted from Sophocles, principally because the only other tragedy so entitled was written by the Alexandrian Aeschylus (*TGF* p. 824). In any case, the plot may be taken to have covered the same ground as the well-known travesty of Plautus. Hartung and Schoell maintained that both Sophocles and Accius dramatized the story of Euripides' *Heracles* under this title, but their view was rightly rejected by Ribbeck (p. 557).

122

ἐπεὶ δὲ βλάστοι, τῶν τριῶν μίαν λαβεῖν
εὔσοιαν ἀρκεῖ.

122 Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 390 *εὐνοίας χάριν*] *ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτέροις τῶν ἀντιγράφων γράφεται εὔσοίας χάριν. ὃ καὶ οἱ ὑπομνηματισάμενοι ἀξιοῦσιν· εὔσοιαν δέ φασι τὴν εὐπένειαν* (*εὐσθένειαν* Suid. *s.v.* *εὔσοια*) *καθάπερ καὶ ἐν Ἀμφιτρύωνι 'ἐπεὶ .. ἀρκεῖ.'*

εὔσοιας has been restored to the text of the *O. C.* from the schol., but the word does not occur elsewhere. The adj. *εὔσοος* is found in Theocr. 24. 8. Cf. Hesych. II p. 233 *εὔσοια· εὐθηνία, σωτηρία.*

The meaning of this fragment is obscure. Welcker (p. 372) interpreted: 'when he is grown, to receive one of these three provides security.' He supposes that Zeus promised to Heracles three safeguards to protect him amidst the dangers of his life, one of which would be at any time sufficient to keep him unharmed; and compares the golden hair of Pterelaus, son of Taphius (Apollod. 2. 51), and for the triplication of the security the three prayers of Theseus. Hartung renders: 'it suffices to find one of your three roads to safety.' but refrains from explaining his meaning further. Neither of these versions takes due account of *ἐπεὶ βλάστοι*, which must be regarded as a clause of general assumption: cf. *Trach.* 93 *καὶ γὰρ ἑστέρῳ τό γ' εὖ πράσσειν, ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, κἄρδοξ ἐμπολᾷ* (J.'s n.). To substitute *βλάστῃ*, as Ellendt and others have proposed, would make no difference, unless *ἀρκεῖ* is taken to be a dynamic (prophetic) present. Bearing this in mind, I cannot help suspecting that the words may refer to the miraculous growth of the heads of the Lernaean Hydra (*ἀμφίκρανον καὶ παλιμβλαστῆ κύνα* Eur. *Her.* 1274): 'and, whenever it grows, it is enough that one of the three should be preserved.' The details of the story are variously recorded: Alcaeus (fr. 118) spoke of nine heads, Simonides (fr. 203) of fifty, and Euripides (*Her.* 1188) of a hundred; and the later authorities have the same or similar variations. Thus it would not be surprising to find that Sophocles mentioned an outcrop of three heads at a time, one of which always survived. And there is a further detail in the mythological handbooks which would help to explain the text. Besides the ordinary version that two heads grew for every one cut off, Apollodorus (2. 77) relates that of the nine heads eight were mortal, but the middle one was immortal (*τὰς μὲν ὀκτὼ θνητάς, τὴν δὲ μέσην ἀθάνατον*): see also *ib.* 80, Pedias. 7. Similarly, Aristonicus of Tarentum (*FHG* IV 337), a writer of uncertain date, said that 'the middle head' was golden.

For the short vowel before *βλάστοι* see Jebb on *Phil.* 1312.—Meineke thought that *μίαν* was an error for *μιᾶς*.

123

ἀμφιτέρμως

123 Hesych. 1 p. 165 *ἀμφιτέρμων· ἀπο- τε -τερματισμένων. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμφιτρύωνι.*

Nauck thinks this form incredible, and that either *ἀμφιτερμώνων* or *ἀμφιτέρμων* is required. But to conclude that an adj. *ἀμφίτερμος*, 'hedged round,' is impossible would be rash in view of the evidence that has been adduced (see Brugmann *Comp. Gr.* II p. 27 E. tr.) for the substitution in compounds of *o*- stems for stems in *n*-: cf. *αὐάρατον, ἀκμόθετον*. It should be added that the preceding gloss in Hesych. is *ἀμφίτερμον* (*-τέρμων* cod.)· *ἀπο < τε > τερματισμένον*.

124

ἄτμητον

124 Hesych. I p. 315 ἀτραυμάτιστον· Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμφιτρύωνι. ἄτμητον· ἀμέριστον.

Inasmuch as ἀτραυμάτιστον is entirely out of place in the alphabetical order, and has no explanatory gloss, the conclusion seems inevitable that ἄτμητον has dropped out before it, and that Sophocles used this word in the *Amphitryon* with the meaning *invulnerable*. This was practically the view of Salmasius, who arranged the words ἄτμητον· ἀμέριστον, ἀτραυμάτιστον. Σ. Ἀ. The gloss ἀμέριστον is probably a reference to Plat., *Phaedr.* 277 B. That ἀτραυμάτιστον was a possible word of explanation is shown by *Etym. M.* p. 110, 52 ἀνούτατος· ὁ ἀτραυμάτιστος. Nauck's suggestion that Σοφ. Ἀμφ. refers to a previous gloss ἀτμησίφρων· οὐδεμιᾶς τόλμης ἔννοιαν ἔχων has very little probability. And that is actually an error for ἀτλησίφρων (Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 438).

[ΑΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΗ]

There is no other reference to a play of Sophocles bearing this title than that of fr. 125 quoted below. But, as there is independent evidence that Sophocles employed the word παρασάγγης with the meaning 'messenger' in the Ποιμένες (see fr. 520), and as Andromache is a character who may very well have appeared in that play, Welcker (p. 113) concludes that there was no such play as the Ἀνδρομάχη, and that fr. 125 really refers to the Ποιμένες. For errors due to the citation of a character in place of the name of a play see p. 38, and the note on fr. 161.

125

παρασάγγης

125 *Etym. M.* p. 652, 13 παρασάγγαι· τὰ τριάκοντα στάδια παρὰ Πέρσαις παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις δ' ἑξήκοντα. παρὰ δὲ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἀνδρομάχῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου εἴρηται. To the same effect *Etym. Gud.* p. 452, 31 with the reading ἐν Ἀνδρομάχῳ.

Nauck in his first edition conjectured that ἐν Ἀνδρομέδᾳ should be read, but now rightly inclines to Welcker's opinion referred to above.

For the word παρασάγγης see on fr. 520, and cf. fr. 183.

ΑΝΔΡΟΜΕΔΑ

There is some direct evidence of the events comprised in the plot of the *Andromeda*. See Eratosth. *Catasterism.* 16 (Westermann, *Mythogr.* p. 250) Κασσιέπεια. ταύτην ἱστορεῖ Σοφοκλῆς ὁ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητὴς ἐν Ἀνδρομέδᾳ ἐρίσασαν περὶ κάλλους ταῖς Νηρηίσιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ σύμπτωμα, καὶ Ποσειδῶνα διαφθεῖραι τὴν χώραν κῆτος ἐπιπέμψαντα, δι' ἣν <αἰτίαν> πρόκειται τῷ κήτει ἡ θυγάτηρ οἰκείως. ἐσχημάτισται δὲ ἐγγὺς ἐπὶ δίφρου καθημένη. *ib.* 36 Κῆτος. τοῦτό ἐστιν ὃ Ποσειδῶν <ἐπ>έπεμψε Κηφεῖ διὰ τὸ Κασσιέπειαν ἐρίσαι περὶ κάλλους ταῖς Νηρηίσιν. Περσεὺς δ'

αὐτὸ ἀνεῖλε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰς τὰ ἄστρα ἐτέθη ὑπόμνημα τῆς πράξεως αὐτοῦ. ἱστορεῖ δὲ ταῦτα Σοφοκλῆς ὁ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητὴς ἐν τῇ Ἀνδρομέδᾳ. The same version is followed in two passages of the scholia to the *Aratea* of Germanicus Caesar (p. 138. 9, 21: see R. Ellis in *J. P.* IV 267, and now E. Maass, *Comment. in Aratum*, pp. 215, 257). Hygin. *poet. astron.* 2. 10 p. 443 *Cassiepeia. de hac Euripides et Sophocles et alii complures dixerunt ut gloriata sit se forma Nereidas praestare. pro quo facto inter sidera sedens in seliquastro constituta est.* But the play cannot be reconstructed to the same extent as is possible with the more famous *Andromeda* of Euripides. The plot of Euripides knows nothing of a previous betrothal to Agenor (or Phineus): Cepheus refuses the proposal of Perseus on other grounds, and his opposition is overcome by the appearance of Athena *ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*. It has been suggested[1] that Sophocles followed the version of the *dénouement* adopted by Hygin. *fab.* 64, according to which Cepheus and Agenor lay in wait for Perseus in order to slay him, but Perseus by showing them the Gorgon's head turned them into stone. But it is difficult to understand how the name of Sophocles found its way into the astronomical handbook, if there was nothing in his play to support the statement that the chief characters in the story were turned into stars. It should be observed that although the story of Perseus and Andromeda is not old—at least there is no trace of it in literature before the fifth century—it was already current at the time of the Persian wars, if we may lay any weight upon the statement of Herodotus (7. 150) that Xerxes claimed kinship with the Argives, as the descendant of Perses, the son of Perseus and Andromeda. It is improbable that Phrynichus had introduced Andromeda into one of his plays, as Dobree inferred from Ar. *Nub.* 556. The reference there is to a comedy: see schol. R and Starkie's note.

Brunck, following Casaubon, considered that Sophocles' *Andromeda* was a satyr-play; but his opinion was founded on no stronger reason than the evidence afforded by fr. 136. Ribbeck, who takes the same view (*Röm. Trag.* p. 163$_{169}$), thinks that fr. 127 has a comic tone and also refers to fr. 132; but his main reason is that Euripides' play would not have been regarded as a startling novelty—as it undoubtedly was—if Sophocles had already treated the subject in a serious manner. But the innovation of Euripides was rather in the romantic setting.

E. Petersen[2] endeavoured to reconstruct the *Andromeda* of

[1] So Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa I 2156.

[2] *J. H. S.* XXIV (1904) pp. 104–112. The identification had been made by earlier critics: see also E. Kuhnert in Roscher III 1994.

Sophocles from a hydria in the British Museum (E 169) which is undoubtedly earlier than 412 B.C., the date of Euripides' play, and is consequently inferred to have been influenced by Sophocles. The painting shows Perseus arriving on foot, whereas in the works of art which follow Euripides he descends from the air; Cepheus weeping for his daughter's fate; posts being fixed into the ground, to which Andromeda is to be lashed; and funeral offerings carried by slaves, as if the king's daughter were already dead. But most stress is laid upon the figure of an effeminate oriental supported by two attendants, who is identified with Phineus[1], the plighted lover of Andromeda. From these materials Petersen draws the inference that the characters of the cowardly barbarian who abandoned his betrothed, and of the heroic Greek who rescued her, were brought into strong contrast at an early stage of the action, and that the subsequent conflict between Perseus and the barbarians was due not to the opposition of Cepheus, but to the renewal of his claim by Phineus after the rescue of the heroine. Petersen further contends that Accius followed Sophocles in his *Andromeda*, whereas Ennius had as usual copied Euripides; but even if he is right, the Latin fragments are too ambiguous to assist his general argument. The value of the archaeological evidence must be left for others to determine[2]; but the attempts by means of it to establish a connexion with Eur. *Alc.* 611 ff., and to interpret fr. 130 as referring to funeral vases, and fr. 133 as a description of Phineus yoked to his attendants cannot be approved.

126

δημιόθυτον κούρειον ἠρέθη πόλει·
τοῖς βαρβάροις γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχῆθεν νόμος
γέρας βρότειον τῷ Κρόνῳ θυηπολεῖν.

126. **1** ἡμιουτὸν cod.: corr. Tucker | κούρειον Musurus: κόριον codd. **2** sq. ordinem verborum in hunc modum disposui: νόμος γάρ ἐστι τοῖς βαρβάροις θυηπολεῖν βρότειον ἀρχῆθεν γέρος τῷ Κρόνῳ cod. **3** γέρας Buttmann: γέρος cod.

126 Hesych. II p. 526 *κουρίον*. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀνδρομέδᾳ. 'ἡμιουτὸν...Κρόνῳ.'

1 The best correction of the corrupt ἡμιουτὸν is Tucker's δημιόθυτον (*C. R.* XVII 190), which H. was inclined to prefer to his own τιμήθυτον or τιμιόθυτον (*C. R.* XIV 113 n.). Both were partly anticipated by M. Schmidt's ἱερόθυτον, Diels's ἀλίθυτον ἦ and Mekler's μιαίθυτον. Less probable conjectures are αἱμόρρυτον Scaliger, ἐνιαύσιον O. Hense, ἡμῖν θυτὸν Campbell (perhaps better ἦ δ' ἔκθυτον), ἡμῖν τόδ' οὖν J. On the assumption that κόριον could stand, which is most

[1] So the name is given by Ovid and Apollodorus (2. 44): Hyginus (*fab.* 64) calls him Agenor. Others consider that the figure represents Andromeda.

[2] See the contrary view taken by Engelmann in *Arch. Jb.* XIX 143; but his conclusion is criticized unfavourably by Gruppe in *Bursians Jahresb.* CXXXVII 394.

improbable, Herwerden proposed ἀζήμιον ('culpa vacans') τὸ κόριον.—For the Attic **κούρειον**, an offering made in connexion with the ceremony of introduction to the phratries see Pollux 8. 107 καὶ εἰς ἡλικίαν προελθόντων ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ κουρεώτιδι ἡμέρᾳ ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ἀρρένων τὸ κούρειον ἔθυον, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν θηλειῶν τὴν γαμηλίαν. For the difficulties of detail which have to be overcome in reconciling the conflicting statements of our authorities see Wyse's *Isaeus*, p. 358, Toepffer in Pauly-Wissowa I 2676. The word has been derived either (1) from κείρω, as signifying an offering made on cutting the hair, or (2) from κόρος (κοῦρος). Both derivations appear to have been put forward in antiquity (Suid. *s.v.*, *Etym. M.* p. 533, 51): for the latter Wyse refers to the Delphic παιδήϊα. In the absence of more precise evidence it is idle to speculate what bearing this passage has on the significance of the κούρειον in primitive times, and whether the animal-victim was the surrogate for a human sacrifice.

21. It is fairly certain that these lines have suffered confusion owing to a dislocation of the original order, and that the displacement was caused by the desire of the scribe to arrange the words according to their grammatical construction: see H. in *C. R.* XVI 245. Cobet, *Coll. Crit.* p. 188. But their rearrangment is not so simple a matter, and there are several possibilities from which I have chosen what seems to me the best (see cr. n.). The objections to Scaliger's τοῖσι βαρβάροις Κρόνῳ | θυηπολεῖν βρότειον ἀρχῆθεν γένος, apart from the introduction of γένος, are (1) the position of ἀρχῆθεν; (2) the distribution of emphasis, which makes it unlikely that νόμος γάρ ἐστι came first. Tucker, who regards ἀρχῆθεν as corrupt and thinks that the articles were later additions, proposed: νόμος γάρ ἐστι βαρβάροις θυηπολεῖν | <θύος> βρότειον, αἱρεθὲν γέρας Κρόνῳ.—**ἀρχῆθεν**: for the history of this word see the admirable account of Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 93, who shows that it and other -θεν forms, after failing to establish themselves in Attic, became fairly common in late Greek. The only objection to the word, apart from its position in the sentence, is the statement in Bekk. *anecd.* p. 421, 5 οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς πλὴν παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ (fr. 416 N.). παρ' Ἡροδότῳ δὲ ἔστι καὶ τοῖς Ἴωσι. But it would be dangerous to refuse the word to Sophocles on this ground alone.—**γέρας** is the certain correction of Buttmann (γένος Scaliger, θέρος Gomperz). For sacrifice as a γέρας of the god cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 256, Achaeus fr. 2, Tr. fr. adesp. 118.—In spite of the frequent occurrence of human sacrifice in the Greek legends, it is always spoken of in literature as something abhorrent to Greek feeling and only suitable to barbarians: cf. Eur. *I. T.* 464 δέξαι θυσίας, | ἃς ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν νόμος οὐχ ὁσίας... ἀναφαίνει. See Stengel, *Kultusaltert.*[2] p. 114 ff. The Greeks identified Cronos with Moloch to whom the Phoenicians sacrificed children: Diodor. 13. 86, 20. 14. [Plat.] *Min.* 315 C. Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 254. For possible traces of human sacrifice in festivals of Κρόνια and Saturnalia see Gruppe in *Bursians Jahresb.* CXXXVII 544 ff. Frazer, *G. B.*[2] III 147 ff. E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*[4], II p. 398. There is an article by the present writer on Human Sacrifice (Greek) in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

127

ἵπποισιν ἢ κύμβαισι ναυστολεῖς χθόνα;

127 Athen. 482 E ὅτι δὲ καὶ πλοῖον ἡ κύμβη, Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀνδρομέδᾳ φησίν 'ἵπποισιν...χθόνα;' Eustath. *Il.* p. 1205, 56 τοιοῦτον καὶ Σοφοκλέους τὸ 'ἵπποισιν... χθόνα,' τουτέστιν ἱππότης ἥκεις ἢ διὰ πλοίου; Phot. *lex.* p. 187, 3 κύμβη· πλοίου εἶδος· Σοφοκλῆς.

The words may be taken to have been addressed to Perseus, but hardly by Andromeda, who must have seen him arrive. But whether the occasion was the banquet which some of the authorities describe as part of the sequel, cannot be determined: see Introductory Note. Petersen attributes the line to Phineus, who, he thinks, might well have used an affected style of utterance. The meaning is correctly given by Eustathius, who, quoting the passage for another purpose, is here independent of Athenaeus. There is thus an instance of zeugma, since ναυστολεῖς does not fit ἵπποισιν: cf. Eur.

Bacch. 687 *ὠνωμένας κρατῆρι καὶ λωτοῦ ψόφῳ*, Aesch. *Prom.* 21 *ὒν' οὔτε φωνὴν οὔτε του μορφὴν βροτῶν | ὄψῃ*, Cope on Arist. *rhet.* 1. 4. 6.—**κύμβαισι** is probably not a native Greek word. Athenaeus here adds that *κύββα* (or a *cup* was said by Apollodorus to be a Paphian word. Cf. Plin. *n. h.* 7. 208 *cumbam Phoenices* (*invenerunt*). Torr, *Ancient Ships*, p. 112 f., not only holds that the use of *κύμβη* indicates that a Phoenician vessel is meant, but also that *ἵππος* was the name given to Phoenician merchant-ships bearing a horse as figure-head. He quotes Strabo 99 (a figure-head recognized as belonging to Gades) *τούτων γὰρ τοὺς μὲν ἐμπόρους μέγαλα στέλλειν πλοῖα, τοὺς δὲ πέντηρας μικρά, ἃ καλεῖν ἵππους ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ταῖς πρῴραις ἐπισήμων*, and refers to Hom. Δ 708 and other passages where ships are compared to horses. But this ingenious interpretation is hardly convincing.—**χθόνα** is, of course, acc. *termini*, not, as L. and S. strangely suggest, of space traversed: cf. Eur. *Med.* 682. It is surprising that E. Mueller, quoted by Hartung, should have taken the use of *ναυστολεῖν* to be evidence of the satyric character of the play.

128

μηδὲν φοβεῖσθαι προσφάτους ἐπιστολάς

128 Phryn. *epit.* p. 374 Lob. (CCCL Ruth.) *πρόσφατον· καὶ περὶ τούτου πολλὴν διατριβὴν ἐποιησάμην, ἐπισκοπούμενος εἰ μόνον λέγεται 'πρόσφατος νεκρός'* (Hdt. 2. 89 etc.) *καὶ μὴ 'πρόσφατον πρᾶγμα.' εὑρίσκετο δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τῇ 'Ανδρομέδᾳ τιθεὶς οὕτω· 'μηδὲν...ἐπιστολάς.'*

Rutherford preferred the variant *φοβεῖσθε*, and there is nothing to decide for one as against the other. Naber plausibly suggested that the words *μηδὲν φοβεῖσθαι* are part of Phrynichus' statement, and do not belong to Sophocles at all; but in that case some alteration of the text would be necessary.

It is curious that Phrynichus should have had so much difficulty in finding an example of *πρόσφατος* in the metaphorical sense, which, as Lobeck points out, is fairly common. It should, however, be observed that the metaphor is vigorous in Aesch. *Cho.* 800 *λύσασθ' αἷμα προσφάτοις δίκαις*, and in Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 299 *εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων | πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς*, of *fresh* water, where all the editors take *πρόσφατον* as an adverb, although Lobeck had indicated the true view. So in Dem. 21. 112 *πρόσφατος* is contrasted with *ἔωλα καὶ ψυχρά*, but in Lys. 18. 19 *ἔτι τῆς ὀργῆς οὔσης προσφάτου* the metaphor is full-grown. Even to Zeno and the Stoics, who defined *λύπη* as *δόξα πρόσφατος κακοῦ παρουσίας* (fr. 143 of my ed., I 212 Arn.), the metaphor was probably still living. In later Greek it became worn-out: see Holden on Plut. *Them.* 24.

129

ἰδοὺ δὲ φοίνιον
μάσθλητα δίγονον

129 *ἰδοὺ δὲ φοίνιον* Brunck: *ἰδοὺ δὲ φοινὸν Etym. M.*, *δίδου δαφοινὸν lex. Sabbait.*

129 *Etym. M.* p. 272, 5 *δίγονος μάσθλης· διπλοῦς ἱμάς· ἢ ὅτι οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν βαφὴν ἦν τοιοῦτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος ἐκέχρωστο. Σοφοκλῆς 'Ανδρομέδᾳ 'ἰδοὺ...δίγονον.' ἐκ τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ· ὁ δύο χρώμασι κεχρωμένος.* An abbreviated form of this note appears in Hesych. 1 p. 503 *δίγονος μάσθλης· ὁ διπλοῦς, ἢ δυσὶ χρώμασι κεχριμένος* (*κεχρημένος* cod., *κεχρωμένος* Musurus): if Campbell had referred to *Etym. M.*, he would not have proposed *ἱμᾶσι κεχρημένος* in Hesych. Hesych. III p. 73 *μάσθλη καὶ μάσθλης· δέρμα καὶ ὑπόδημα φοινικοῦν. καὶ ἡνία. διφθέρα. μάσθλητας* (*μάσθλη τὰς* cod.) *τομουτὰς* (*τομούς· τὰς* Wecklein) *ἡνίας.*

καὶ γὰρ ἡ μάσθλη (ἱμάσθλη Bruno Keil). Σοφοκλῆς Ἀνδρομέδᾳ καὶ Συνδείπνοις. For the last extract see fr. 571. The quotation, without lemma or explanation, is found in *Lex. Sabbait.* p. 50, 18.

μάσθλητα δίγονον had received two traditional explanations, (1) as a double lash, (2) as a lash stained with blood in addition to its original colour. We need not hesitate to prefer the former, which is established by *Ai.* 241 *μέγαν ἱπποδέτην μαστῆρα λαβὼν | παίει λιγυρᾷ μάστιγι διπλῇ*. It appears from the epithet λιγυρᾷ that Sophocles understood the Homeric *μάστιξ* as a whip rather than a goad: see Λ 532. Notwithstanding the contrary opinions of Verrall and Tucker (on *Theb.* 595), it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that **διπλῇ μάστιγι** in *Ag.* 647, and **διπλῆς μαραγνης** in *Cho.* 374, refer to a double *lash*, and that Leaf (on Ψ 387) is mistaken in extending the inference which he draws from Homeric usage to the language of the tragedians. On the other hand, it will be observed that these passages do not relate to the driving of chariots, and it is certain that goads (*El.* 718, *Enn.* 156, Eur. *Hipp.* 1194, *I. A.* 220, *Phoen.* 182, *Her.* 881, 949) with a double point (*O. T.* 809) were employed for that purpose. The only passage in tragedy where it might plausibly be urged that *μάστιξ* = *κέντρον* is *Ai.* 1253; and there Jebb renders it *whip*. Herwerden (*Mnem.* XVII 265) proposed **δίτονον**, not without reason; for there is nothing in the use of *δίγονος, τρίγονος, διφυής*, etc. which supports their extension to other than natural multiplication.

130

αὐτοχειλέσι ληκύθοις

130 Pollux 10. 120 Σοφοκλῆς δ' ἐν Ἀνδρομέδᾳ *αὐτοχειλέσι ληκύθοις* (*λίθοις* cod. C) *ἤφη, δηλῶν ἀλαβάστους μονολίθους*.

Hemsterhuis conjectured *αὐτολίθοισι ληκύθοις*, and Wakefield *αὐτοκόλλοις ληκύθοις*; but there is no ground for these suspicions. **αὐτοχειλέσι** indicates that the rim of the flask or pot was of the same material as the rest of the vessel. It was the custom to gild the edges of silver cups, or to cover horn with silver: cf. Aesch. fr. 185 *ἀργυρηλάτοις | κέρασι χρυσᾶ στόμα προσβεβλημένοις*, quoted by Athen. 476 C. Similarly Theopompus *ἐν δευτέρᾳ Φιλιππικῶν* (*FHG* I 285 ap. Athen. *l.c.* D) says that the kings of the Paeonians *τῶν βοῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς γινομένων μεγάλα κέρατα φιάντων, ὡς χωρεῖν τρεῖς καὶ τέτταρες χόας, ἐκπώματα ποιεῖν ἐξ αὐτῶν, τὰ χείλη περιαργυροῦντας καὶ χρυσοῦντας*. But the practice was as old as Homer: *δ* 615 *δώσω τοι κρητῆρα τετυγμένον. ἀργύρεοι δέ | εἰσιν ἄπαν, χρυσῷ δ' ἐπὶ χείλεα κεκράανται, ib.* 132. Thus the compound means 'with natural rims,' and the whole phrase is exactly parallel to *αὐτόκωπα βέλη* in Aesch. *Cho.* 163, weapons whose hilt is in one piece with the blade. Similar are *αὐτοκτίτου δόμου* fr. 331, *αὐτοσπέρου βήματος O. C.* 193, *αὐτόξυλόν γ' ἔκπωμα Phil.* 35, and other instances quoted in the n. on Eur. *Hel.* 356.—*αὐτοχειλέσι* is the regular accentuation, as Blaydes points out: see Chandler, § 698 fl. But Nauck and Dindorf print *αὐτοχείλεσι*, following, I suppose, the tradition in Pollux.

Observe that the words form an ordinary glyconic line.

131

ἀμφίπρυμνον πλοῖον

131 Hesych. I p. 164 *ἀμφίπρυμνον πλοῖον· ἑκατέρωθεν πρύμνας ἔχον. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀνδρομέδᾳ. καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ πλωτούμενα πλοῖα*. The last clause is unintelligible, and neither Musurus's *πεμπόμενα* nor M. Schmidt's *στόλῳ ἑπόμενα* throws any light on the mystery. Luebeck (Pauly-Wissowa I 1953) thinks that boats like our Life Boats are meant.

ἀμφίπρυμνον. This adjective is applied to vessels which for various reasons were so constructed that they could be propelled in either direction without turning. Dio Cass. 74. 11, describing the siege of Byzantium by Septimius Severus: *καί τινα αὐτῶν (πλοῖον) ἑκατέρωθεν καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρύμνης καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρῴρας πηδαλίοις ἤσκητο...ὅπως αὐτοῖ μὴ ἀναστρεφόμενοι*

καὶ ἐπιπλέωσι καὶ ἀναχωρῶσι, καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσπλῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀπόπλῳ σφῶν σφάλλωσι. Germanicus built such boats for his campaign: Tac. *Ann.* 4. 6 *plures adpositis utrimque gubernaculis, converso ut repente remigio hinc vel illinc adpellerent.* They were also used by the Germans (Tac. *Germ.* 44) and by the inhabitants of the coasts of the Euxine (*Hist.* 3. 47). Athen. 204 A, E mentions certain vessels of Ptolemy Philopator, one of these a state barge, which he describes as δίπρῳροι and δίπρυμνοι; and it is inferred that they also were of this kind, although Schweighäuser thought otherwise (vol. XI p. 232 on 489 B, where a δίπρῳρος is compared to a cup παρακειμένως ἔχοντα τὰ ὦτα). I take this opportunity of remarking, in view of the explanations still given in some books, that the meaning of ἀμφῆρες δόρυ in Eur. *Cycl.* 15 and ἀκάτιον ἀμφηρικόν in Thuc. 4. 67 is fixed by the schol. on the latter passage (ἐν ᾧ ἕκαστος τῶν ἐλαυνόντων δικωπίᾳ ἐρέττει); they were sculling-boats, and were named ἀμφήρη because each one of the crew propelled the vessel on both sides. See also Blaydes on Ar. *Eccl.* 1091. Is it possible that the κῆτος was compared to an ἀμφίπρυμνον πλοῖον, because he could so readily shift himself to meet an attack from any quarter? He is compared to a ship rushing through the waves in Ov. *Met.* 4. 706. [I have since learnt that the suggestion has been anticipated for the same reason by Petersen: see Introductory Note.]

132

ἀμβλύσκει

132 Hesych. I p. 141 ἀμβλύσκει· ἐξαμβλοῖ (ἐξαπλοῖ cod.: corr. Salmasius) κυρίως δὲ ἐπὶ ἀμπέλου. καὶ ἐκτιτρώσκει. μδ Σοφοκλῆς Ἀνδρομέδᾳ (ἀνδρο cod.).

M. Schmidt maintained that the form ἀμβλύσκω was an error, and that either ἀμβλίσκω (Plat.) or ἀμβλώσκω (Suid.) should be substituted. Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 210, refused to condemn ἀμβλύσκω as a possible derivative from ἄμβλυς; and the evidence does not warrant a dogmatic conclusion. All we can say is that ἀμβλίσκω and ἐξαμβλοῦν are the best-attested forms, and that ἐκτιτρώσκειν is Ionic and Hellenistic. Both Lobeck and Rutherford (p. 289) make the strange mistake of assigning ἐκτιτρώσκειν to Sophocles on the strength of the above passage of Hesychius. But it is obviously part of the explanation attached to ἀμβλύσκει (or ἀμβλίσκει). Cf. Hesych. II p. 115 ἐξαναβλοῦμεν (?)· ἐκτιτρώσκομεν. Suid. ἐξαμβλίσκειν· ἐκτιτρώσκειν.

133

ζευξίλεως

133 Hesych. II p. 256 ζευξίλεως· ζευκτὸς λαός (ζευκτὴς λαοῦ Ellendt), ἢ ᾧ ὑπεζευγμένοι εἰσὶ λαοί. Σοφοκλῆς (σοφῶς cod.) Ἀνδρομέδᾳ. Cf. Phot. *lex.* p. 53, 8 (= Suid. *s.v.* ζευξίλεως) ζευξίλεως· ᾧ ὑπεζευγμένοι εἰσὶν οἱ λαοί. Eustath. *Il.* p. 401, 11 ζευξίλεως εἴρηται παρὰ τοῖς μεθ' Ὅμηρον ὁ βασιλεύς.

The description refers to an oriental despotism, where the subjects were crushed beneath the yoke of slavery: Isocr. 4. 151 τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς διὰ τὰς μοναρχίας ταπεινὰς καὶ περιδεεῖς ἔχοντες. Plat. *Menex.* 240 A αἱ δὲ γνῶμαι δεδουλωμέναι ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἦσαν, *ibid.* C Ἀθηναίους ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ταύτῃ ἀνάγκῃ ζεύξαντας Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἄγειν. Aesch. *Pers.* 594 οὐδ' ἔτι γλῶσσα βροτοῖσιν | ἐν φυλακαῖς· λέλυται γὰρ | λαὸς ἐλεύθερα βάζειν, | ὡς ἐλύθη ζυγὸν ἀλκᾶς. For the metaphor in general see Jebb on *Ai.* 24.

134

οἰήτας

134 Phot. *lex.* p. 317, 7 *οἰήτας· τοὺς κωμήτας.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἀνδρομέδᾳ. Hesych. III p. 182 *οἰητῶν· κωμητῶν* (*οἰατῶν· κομήτων* cod.) *οἶαι* (*οἱ* cod.) *γὰρ αἱ κῶμαι. ibid.* p. 183 *οἰητῶν· κωμητῶν* (*κομητῶν* cod.).

The word *οἴη* for a *village* occurs in Apoll. Rhod. 2. 138 *πέρθοντο γὰρ ἠμὲν ἀλωαί | ἠδ' οἶαι τῆμος δῄῳ ὑπὸ δουρὶ Λύκοιο.* It corresponds to the Laconian *ὠβά*, a local division of the country (Gilbert, *Staatsalt.*[2] p. 45), in which *β* appears to represent *F*. See Curtius, *Gr. Et.* II p. 214 E. tr.: but the connexion with *ἰαύω* is inadmissible. Oea was the name of an Attic deme (*O. C.* 1061, with Jebb's n.), and also a place-name in Thera.

135

σάρητον

135 Hesych. IV p. 6 *σαλητόν· Σοφοκλῆς Ἀνδρομέδᾳ. Ἀντίπατρος* (*ἀντὶ πατρὸς ἢ* cod. A grammarian of this name is mentioned in schol. Ar. *Av.* 1403) *βαρβαρικὸν χιτῶνα. οἱ δὲ καὶ μεσόλευκον αὐτὸν εἶναί φασι.* See however *ibid.* p. 11 *σαρητον· ὁ καὶ σάραπις, εἶδος χιτῶνος.* And this form is supported by Phot. *lex.* p. 501, 24 *σάρητον· βαρβαρικὸς χιτών.* Cf. Hesych. IV p. 10 *σάραπις· Περσικὸς χιτὼν μεσόλευκος, ὡς Κτησίας.* Poll. 7. 61 *ὁ δὲ σάραπις. Μήδων τὸ φόρημα, πορφυροῦς μεσόλευκος χιτών.* Phot. *lex.* p. 500, 7 *σάραπις· χιτὼν Περσικὸς μεσόλευκος.* Demoer. Ephes. (*FHG* IV 383) ap. Athen. 525 C *σαράπεις μήλινοι καὶ πορφυροῖ καὶ λευκοί, οἱ δὲ ἀλουργεῖς.*

Such a tunic was part of the royal apparel of the Persian king: Xen. *Cyr.* 8. 3. 13 *ὀρθὴν ἔχων τὴν τιάραν καὶ χιτῶνα πυρφυροῦν μεσόλευκον,—ἄλλῳ δ' οὐκ ἔξεστι μεσόλευκον ἔχειν.* It was adopted by Alexander when he assumed the Persian dress: Athen. 537 E, Plut. *Alex.* 51 (where *διαλευκος* is used for *μεσόλευκος*). Elsewhere we find it worn by upstarts and impostors, such as Lysias the Epicurean philosopher who became tyrant of Tarsus (Athen. 215 C), or Alexander the false prophet in Lucian *Alex.* 11.

136

Πᾶνες

136 Schol. Theocr. 4. 62 *τοὺς σατύρους πλείους φησίν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς Σειληνούς καὶ Πᾶνας, ὡς Αἰσχύλος μὲν ἐν Γλαύκῳ* (fr. 35), *Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Ἀνδρομέδᾳ.*

So the extract is given by Nauck, without stating his authority. Duebner gives the opening words as *τοὺς σατύρους οἱ πλείονές φασιν*, and notes that EU have *καὶ σατυρίσκους τοὺς Πᾶνας οἱ πλείους φασιν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς Σειληνοὺς καὶ τοὺς σατύρους.* Dindorf prints *τοὺς σατύρους ἀφαρεῖς οἱ πλειονές φασιν*, where the addition of *ἀφαρεῖς* is due to a conjecture of Casaubon. Nauck inferred that Sophocles spoke of Sileni in the plural on the ground that the authority of Aeschylus is quoted, as other evidence shows, for the existence of two Pans. But he subsequently admitted (*Index*, p. xi) that the true solution had been found by Wecklein (*Sitzungsb. d. K. B. Akad.* 1870 I p. 31), and that we ought to read *τοὺς Πᾶνας σατύρους*, as printed in Ahrens's and Ziegler's editions. The passage in Theocritus runs: *τό τοι γένοι ἢ Σατυρίσκοισι | ἐγγύθεν ἢ Πάνεσσι κακοστάμοισιν ἐρίσδει.* So soon as we consider what comment is likely to have been made on these words requiring the citation of parallels, it becomes clear that the editor, possibly Theon himself, was defending the use of *Πᾶνες* in the plural by Theocritus.

The alternative offered by Casaubon's restoration would be inconsistent with the quotation from Aeschylus. Pan was acknowledged by Herodotus (2. 145) to be one of the youngest of the Greek gods, and his name hardly appears in literature before the fifth century B.C. It seems highly probable that the generic use of the name is actually the earlier, and that Pan the god is developed and individualized from the class of demonic beings with whom the rustic fancy populated the hills and forests of Arcadia. The same history has been deduced for the parallel conception of the Italian Faunus: see Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p. 260. For other early evidence of the plural cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 1069 ὦ Πᾶνες, Plat. *legg.* 815 C Νύμφας τε καὶ Πᾶνας καὶ Σιληνοὺς καὶ Σατύρους ἐπονομάζοντες. The *Panisci*, parallel to σατυρίσκοι, are not mentioned before Cicero (*n. d.* 3. 43), but this is probably accidental. See also *A. P.* 6. 108 ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ἔφοροι, κεραοί, χοροταῖκται, | Πᾶνες, βουχίλου κράντορες Ἀρκαδίης. Prop. 3. 17. 34. Pausan. 8. 37. 2.

ΑΝΤΗΝΟΡΙΔΑΙ

The following extract from Strabo (608) is usually referred to the *Antenoridae*. 'Sophocles says that at the capture of Troy a leopard's skin was placed in front of the door of Antenor, to serve as a warning that the house was to remain unscathed. Accordingly, Antenor and his sons, together with the Eneti who had joined them, found their way in safety to Thrace, and thence escaped to the country called Enetica on the Adriatic. Then also Aeneas, together with his father Anchises and his son Ascanius, collected his followers and set sail[1].' The leopard's skin was also mentioned in the *Locrian Ajax* (fr. 11). Pausanias (10. 27. 3), describing the picture of Polygnotus in the Lesche at Delphi, which set forth the incidents belonging to the capture of Troy, referred to the house of Antenor, with its leopard's skin over the entrance; in front of it were represented Antenor and his wife Theano (Hom. Z 298), with their sons Glaucus and Eurymachus, and their daughter Crino and her infant The leopard's skin is mentioned in the same connexion by schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 5. 110.

In the same account (10. 26. 7, 8) Pausanias states that Lesches in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 13 K.) related the rescue by Odysseus of Helicaon, another of Antenor's sons, when wounded in the night-battle; and gives reasons for concluding that his wife Laodice was exempted from the fate of the other Trojan women. Apollodorus (*epit.* 5. 21) similarly recounts that Odysseus and Menelaus, recognizing Glaucus the son of Antenor, as he was fleeing to his house, saved him by force of arms. Pindar (*Pyth.* 5. 83) followed the tradition that the Antenoridae settled at Cyrene: ἔχοντι τὰν χαλκοχάρμαι ξενοι | Τρῶες Ἀντανορίδαι· σὺν

[1] Strabo is extracted by Eustath. *Il.* p. 405, 29.

Ἑλένᾳ γὰρ μόλον, | καπνωθεῖσαν πάτραν ἐπεὶ ἴδον. The family was so numerous that its migrations might well have been in more than one direction. Bacchylides spoke of them as fifty: schol. Hom. Ω 496 πιθανὸν μίαν τεκεῖν ἑ', οὐχ ὡς Βακχυλίδης ν' τῆς Θεανοῦς ὑπογράφει παῖδας. Homer names eleven: besides Coon, Demoleon, Iphidamas, Laodamas, and Pedaeus, who were killed, Acamas, Agenor, Archelochus, Helicaon, Laodocus, and Polybus[1]; and Verg. *Aen.* 6. 483 has *Glaucumque Medontaque Thersilochumque,* | *tris Antenoridas,* though these three are not so specified in Homer P 216. A few other names besides those which have been already mentioned appear in later writers.

The reasons which induced the Greeks to accord a special protection to Antenor are recorded in Qu. 13. 291 ff. and more briefly in Tryphiod. 656 ff. τέκνα δε καὶ γενεὴν Ἀντήνορος ἀντιθέοιο | Ἀτρεΐδης ἐφύλαξε, φιλοξείνοιο γέροντος, | μειλιχίη προτέρης τίνων χάριν, ἠδὲ τραπέζης | κείνης, ἣ μιν ἔδεκτο γυνὴ πρηεῖα Θεανώ. Cf. Tzetz. *Posthom.* 741 ff. οἵην μὲν Ἀντήνορος εἰρύσαιντο γενεθλην | Ἀργεῖοι ξενίης μνήμην φορέοντες ἐκείνου, | παρδαλέην προθύροις ἀριγνωτον σῆμα βαλόντες. He had entertained Menelaus and Odysseus, when they came to Troy to demand the restoration of Helen (Hom. Γ 207), and protected them from injury (schol. *ad loc.*). He was the leader of the peace-party among the Trojans, and had recommended the surrender of Helen and her treasure (H 347 ff.; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1. 2. 9); and his honied speech was compared to that of Nestor: εἴ μοι τὸ Νεστόρειον εὔγλωσσον μέλος | Ἀντήνορός τε τοῦ Φρυγὸς δοίη θεός (Eur. fr. 899).

The tradition that Troy fell in consequence of the *treachery* of Antenor has not been traced to any early writer[2]; and there is no evidence to show that Sophocles was acquainted with it.

It is generally admitted that the passage in Strabo contains a summary in brief of the plot of the *Antenoridae*[3]; for otherwise the allusion cannot be traced to its source. It is scarcely to be referred to the *Locrian Ajax*; for the incidents related by Strabo, if included in the action, would have been incompatible with the dramatic development of the fate of Ajax. There is, moreover, a play of Accius with the same title; and it is unreasonable to doubt that it was adapted from Sophocles (Ribbeck, *Rom. Trag.* p. 406 ff.). The Latin fragments are more plentiful than the

[1] Jebb, *Bacchyl.* p. 221, who mentions only ten, has omitted Laodamas (O 516).

[2] It appears first in Lycophr. 340, where see Holzinger. Wagner in Pauly-Wissowa 1 2352 thinks that it was a late invention.

[3] Bergk, however, in his early work on the Fragments (*de frag. Soph.* p. 3), dissented, holding that the substance of Strabo's reference was drawn from the *Locrian Ajax*. But he failed to give a satisfactory account of the *Antenoridae*, which, on the strength of the fragments of Accius, he guessed to contain the arrival of Rhesus.

Greek, and in at least one important particular they assist in enlarging our conception of the plot. From the story as outlined above we receive no impression of a dramatic conflict. Antenor was saved by the Greeks in consideration of his past services, and that is all. But Accius has: *ad populum intellego referundum, quoniam horum aequiter sententiae | fuere* (fr. 1). From this it was inferred by Welcker that the Greek view in favour of Antenor was by no means unanimous, and that he was saved from destruction only after a protracted conflict[1]. What may have been the arguments on the one side or the other we have no means of ascertaining; but the association of Antenor with the Eneti is a circumstance which perhaps bore nearly on the issue. In Homer this people are a Paphlagonian tribe (B 852) under the leadership of Pylaemenes, and are reckoned among the Trojan allies; but the fragments of Accius led Welcker to conclude (p. 169) that a new leader had arrived with a fresh contingent of Eneti just before the capture of the city: *namque huc em venio ut mea ope opes Troiae integrem* (fr. IV); *qui aut illorum copias | fundam in campo, aut navis uram, aut castra mactabo in mare* (fr. V.).

It will be noticed that, according to Strabo, Sophocles recognised the connexion of Antenor with the settlement of Eneti (Veneti) in the north of Italy. We thus get an interesting link with the Latin authorities: Liv. 1. 1 *iam primum omnium satis constat, Troia capta, in ceteros saevitum esse Troianos; duobus, Aenea Antenoreque, et vetusti iure hospitii et quia pacis reddendaeque Helenae semper auctores fuerunt, omne ius belli Achivos abstinuisse, casibus deinde variis Antenorem cum multitudine Henetum, qui, seditione ex Paphlagonia pulsi, et sedes et ducem, rege Pylaemene ad Troiam amisso, quaerebant, venisse in intimum maris Hadriatici sinum, Euganeisque qui inter mare Alpesque incolebant pulsis, Henetos Troianosque eas tenuisse terras: et in quem primum egressi sunt locum Troia vocatur, pagoque inde Troiano nomen est, gens universa Veneti adpellati.* Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1. 242 ff. Further confirmation of Strabo's evidence is to be found in Polyb. 2. 17. 6, who asserts that the tragic playwrights told strange stories respecting the settlement of the Veneti (*περὶ ὧν οἱ τραγῳδιογράφοι πολύν τινα πεποίηνται λόγον καὶ πολλὴν*

[1] Ribbeck (p. 408) interprets differently. According to him, the reference is to a decision of the Trojan people, after the council had been equally divided on the question whether a last attempt should be made to secure a friendly arrangement by the surrender of Helen after the death of Paris; and here Antenor, as on earlier occasions, was the advocate of peace. This seems less likely. Ahrens thought that, though Antenor's life was spared, his treachery was condemned, and he was refused permission to settle in the Troad. Therefore he was sent away with the Eneti, who, owing to the lateness of their arrival, would feel no resentment against him.

διατίθενται τερατείαν): in customs and dress, according to him, these people closely resemble the Celts, but differ from them in language. Strabo elsewhere (48, 150, 543) mentions the settlement of Antenor and the Eneti as a common tradition, and in 212 appeals in support of it to the fact that Dionysius of Syracuse recruited his racing stable from Venetia, recalling the line in Homer (*l.c.*) which connected the Paphlagonian Eneti with ἡμιόνων γένος ἀγροτεράων (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 231). For the trade route between the Black Sea and the Adriatic see Ridgeway, *Early Age in Greece*, 1 p. 366. According to him, the Veneti were Illyrians, *i.e.* Pelasgians belonging to the melanochrous dolichocephalous race indigenous in the Mediterranean (*ib.* p. 377).

The omission of the *Laocoon* and the inclusion of the *Antenoridae* in the list of Trojan plays given in the Argument to the *Ajax* (p. 3, ed. Jebb) suggested to Robert (*Bild und Lied*, p. 201) the identification of the two titles; but he recognized that there was much to be said on the other side. Fr. 373, as compared with Strabo 608, indicates that the departure of Aeneas may have been mentioned in both plays.

The fourteenth poem of Bacchylides is entitled Ἀντηνορίδαι ἢ Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις. Theano opens the door of Athena's temple in order to receive Menelaus and Odysseus on their embassy; and it is evident, in spite of a lacuna, that they are conducted by the sons of Antenor, who goes himself to inform Priam. The Trojans are summoned to the agora, and pray to the gods for a cessation of their sufferings. The debate is opened by Menelaus with a brief warning that Zeus is not the author of men's troubles; δίκη lies within the choice of all, while ὕβρις, her opposite, leads to ruin and destruction. At this point the ode abruptly ends. Jebb (p. 220) remarks: 'Blass and Wilamowitz regard the double title of the Bacchylidean poem as making it probable that the Ἀντηνορίδαι of Sophocles was only another name for his Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις. Such a second title for the tragedy is intelligible, however, only if the sons of Antenor formed the chorus; but, in the case of such a drama, is that probable?' It may be added that, if this identification were accepted, it would be necessary to find another solution for the title Ἑλένης ἁρπαγή mentioned in the Argument to the *Ajax* in place of the current hypothesis that it is an error for Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις.

137

ὄρνιθα καὶ κήρυκα καὶ διάκονον

137 Athen. 373 C, D *ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀρσενικοῦ οὐ μόνον ὄρνιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄρνιθα...καὶ Σοφοκλῆς Ἀντηνορίδαις 'ὄρνιθα...διάκονον.'*

The reference underlying this quotation is obscure. (1) Hartung suggests that **ὄρνιθα**=*omen*, as in *O. T.* 52 (Jebb): see also on Eur. *Hel.* 1051. Some slight confirmation may be drawn from the fact that Aesch. fr. 95 is quoted by Athenaeus directly afterwards. (2) Ellendt holds that *ὄρνιθα* is the eagle. He is presumably thinking of the rape of Ganymede, and of such passages as Pind. *Isth.* 6. 50. So apparently Blaydes, who renders **καὶ κήρυκα** '*both* as herald.'

138

ἀφεψιασάμην

138 Hesych. I p. 334 *ἀφεψιασάμην· ἀφωμίλησα. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀντηνορίδαις* (*ἀντινορίδαις* cod.). Bekk. *anecd.* p. 470, 13 *ἀφεψιαίμην· ἀφωμίλησα. οὕτω Σοφοκλῆς.* Eustath. *Od.* p. 1831, 3 *ἀφεψιασάμην ἤτοι ἀφωμίλησα, ὡς ἐν ῥητορικῷ κεῖται λεξικῷ* (Ael. et Paus. fr. 389 Schwabe, who however prints *ἐφεψιασάμην* without comment).

For this word and its cognates see on fr. 3. *ἐφεψιᾶσθαι* occurs in Hom. *τ* 331, 370, *καθεψιᾶσθαι ib.* 372, and the simple verb in *ρ* 530 and the Alexandrian poets.

139

ἐκβαβράξαι

139 *ἐκβαβάξαι* cod.: corr. H

139 Hesych. II p. 40 *ἐκβαβάξαι· ἐκσαλεῦσαι. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀντηνορίδαις* (*ἐν τῇ νορίδες* cod.).

There appears to be something wrong with the tradition: M. Schmidt conj. *ἐκάμαξε· ἐσάλευσε*, but a simpler and more attractive remedy was Pearson's *ἐκλαλῆσαι* for *ἐκσαλεῦσαι*. Hesych. I p. 349 has *βαβάζειν· τὸ <μὴ> διηρθρωμένα λέγειν. ἔνιοι δὲ βοᾶν*, and several scholars support *εἰ μὴ βαβάζει γ'* in Ar. *Av.* 1681. Cf. *βαβάκτης* (Cratinus) and *βάβαξ* (Archilochus). But Hesych. *l.c.* has also *βαβράζων· κεκραγὼς συντόνως*, and this is supported by Ananius (fr. 5) ap. Athen. 282 B *ὅταν θέρος τ' ᾖ κἠχέται βαβράζωσιν*, of chirruping crickets.

H., however, thought that *ἐκσαλεῦσαι* was sound, and restored *ἐκβαβράξαι* with the sense 'to toss up as the sea does, or boiling water.' He relied on the use of *βράσσω*, *βράζω* and *βρύζω*, and held that *βαβράζω* was related to *βρύζω* as *παφλάζω* to *φλύζω*, *καχλάζω* to *κλύζω*. The association with sound (*βρυχάομαι* etc.) is paralleled by *περιβρύχιος* (schol. *Ant.* 336). For *ἐκσαλεῦσαι*='to shake out' see Suid. *ἐκσάλευσον αὐτό. ἐξένεγκον*, Ar. *Lys.* 1028 (where *ἐκσκάλευσον* is now read), and *ἐκσαλάσσω* in *A. P.* 5. 235.

ΑΤΡΕΥΣ Η ΜΥΚΗΝΑΙΑΙ

This play cannot be considered apart from the title *Thyestes* (p 185). There is surprisingly little evidence for the existence of an *Atreus*: Hesychius quotes Ἀτρεῖ ἢ Μυκήναις, and a scholiast on Euripides refers to Μυκηναίαις. The *Thyestes* is quoted twenty-two times, for the most part simply under that title; but Hesychius refers four times to Θυέστης Σικυώνιος, once to Θυέστης ὁ ἐν Σικυῶνι, and twice to Θυέστης δεύτερος, and Orion cites ἐκ τοῦ α΄ Θυέστου. On these facts it has generally been held that Sophocles wrote three plays dealing with the gruesome legends concerning the two brothers; that the famous incidents of the golden lamb and the Thyestes-feast occurred in the *Atreus*; and that the plays entitled *Thyestes* related to the unnatural intercourse of Thyestes with his daughter, and the fatal issue by which Aegisthus became the appointed avenger of his father (Welcker, pp. 357—370). The problem is unusually intricate, and it is hardly possible from the existing data to ascertain which parts of the traditional material were selected by Sophocles for treatment. The fragments themselves, with the possible exception of fr. 247, which seems to refer to the Sicyon-story, do not give any assistance towards the unravelling of the plots; and it is scarcely legitimate to draw any inference from the more numerous fragments of Accius, whose *Atreus* (Aul. Gell. 13. 2. 2) has been supposed to be an adaptation of Sophocles: see especially the passages quoted by Cic. *n. d.* 3. 68, *de orat.* 3. 217, 219. For it must be remembered that Ennius had already written a *Thyestes*; and, while it is likely that both these Roman tragedies dealt rather with the central motive of the story than with its outlying incidents, we cannot believe that Accius was content simply to reproduce the treatment of Sophocles. Indeed, his known attitude towards his models forbids such a conclusion: it is certain that in his *Antigone* he departed widely from Sophocles, and his *Philoctetes* depended on more than one original (Schanz, *Rom. Litt.* p. 76).

Hitherto it has not been convincingly shown that Sophocles wrote more than two plays upon the story of the brothers, one containing the events which occurred at Mycenae, and the other the Sicyon-story. Since everyone hearing the name Thyestes at once recalls the banquet, the other part of his story when referred to would naturally be distinguished as happening in Sicyon, even though the banquet-play were known by the title *Atreus*; and, on the other hand, it would not be unnatural for the banquet-play, whatever its traditional title may have been, to

be referred to either as *Thyestes* or as *Atreus*. This may be illustrated by Epict. *diss.* 1. 28. 32 *καὶ ποία τραγῳδία ἄλλην ἀρχὴν ἔχει; Ἀτρεὺς Εὐριπίδου τί ἐστι; τὸ φαινόμενον*, which is admitted to be a reference to the *Thyestes* of Euripides. For the present, however, we may put aside the question of the contents of the play (or plays) entitled *Thyestes*, except in so far as that title may have been an alternative for *Atreus*. No one denies that Sophocles wrote a play covering much the same ground as Seneca's *Thyestes*, whatever its exact title may have been. The general ambit of these plays may be gathered from Dio Chrys. 66. 6 (II p. 162 Arn.) *ὅτι μὲν γὰρ διὰ χρυσοῦν πρόβατον ἀνάστατον συνέβη γενέσθαι τηλικαύτην οἰκίαν τὴν Πέλοπος οἱ τραγῳδοί φασιν. καὶ κατεκόπη μὲν τὰ τοῦ Θυέστου τέκνα, τῇ Πελοπίᾳ δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἐμίχθη καὶ τὸν Αἴγισθον ἔσπειρεν...τούτοις δὲ οὐκ ἄξιον ἀπιστεῖν, ἃ γέγραπται μὲν οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων ἀνδρῶν, Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους, λέγεται δὲ ἐν μέσοις τοῖς θεάτροις.* We may also infer that the golden lamb was the initial cause of the trouble between the brothers, according to both tragedians, and in this respect they appear to have followed the author of the *Alcmaeonis* (schol. Eur. *Or.* 997). Is it possible to obtain a better estimate of the scope of the banquet-play? The answer will depend upon the weight to be assigned to schol. rec. Eur. *Or.* 812 (Atreus and Thyestes, contending for the throne, agreed that whichever could produce some divine sign should prevail) *ἐν τοῖς ποιμνίοις δὲ τοῦ Ἀτρέως εἴρηται χρυσοῦν ἀρνίον μήνιδι Ἑρμοῦ...καὶ μέλλοντος Ἀτρέως δεῖξαι τὸ τέρας τοῖς δικασταῖς, καὶ λαβεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, Ἀερόπη ἡ τούτου γυνὴ μοιχευομένη Θυέστῃ τῷ ἀνδραδέλφῳ, κλέψασα τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ. Θυέστης δὲ λαβὼν τοῦτο καὶ δείξας τοῖς δικασταῖς, τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐκράτησε. μὴ ἀνασχόμενος οὖν Ἀτρεὺς τὴν συμφοράν, ἀλλὰ δυσχεραίνων, ὅτι ἀδίκως ἐστέρηται τῆς ἀρχῆς, ὁμοῦ τε τὴν γυναῖκα Ἀερόπην τιμωρεῖται κατ' ἄμφω, καὶ ὅτι ἐμοιχεύετο Θυέστῃ, καὶ ὅτι κέκλοφε τὸ ἀρνίον καὶ δέδωκεν αὐτῷ, ῥίψας αὐτὴν εἰς θάλασσαν, ὥς φησι Σοφοκλῆς, καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς υἱοὺς τοῦ Θυέστου, Ἄγλαον, Ὀρχομενόν, καὶ Κάλεον, ἀποκτείνας παρέθηκεν εἰς τράπεζαν τῷ πατρί, καὶ αὐτὸν ὕστερον ἀπέκτεινεν. δι' ἃ ὁ ἥλιος μὴ στέρξας τὸ παράνομον, μίαν ἡμέραν ἐκ δυσμῶν πρὸς ἕω διφρεύει κτέ.* The notion of Atreus and Thyestes submitting their claims to a panel of jurymen is certainly not old, but that the lamb was a mark of divine favour and that its possessor was entitled to claim the succession are propositions so well supported that they are much more likely to belong to the original legend than the variant recorded by Apollod. *epit.* 2. 10. Cf. Eur. *El.* 722 *τέρας ἐκκομίζει πρὸς δώματα· νεόμενος δ' | εἰς ἀγόρους αὐτεῖ | τὰν κερόεσσαν ἔχειν χρυσεόμαλλον κατὰ δῶμα ποίμναν.* Acc. fr. VIII *quod mihi*

portento caelestum pater | prodigium misit, regni stabilimen mei. Sen. *Thyest.* 230 *possessor huius regnat, hunc cunctae domus | fortuna sequitur.* The purport of the reference to Sophocles has been variously estimated. If it is intended for the *Atreus*, as Dindorf and other scholars thought, we obtain a valuable clue to the construction of that play; but it may be merely an inaccurate reminiscence of *Ai.* 1295,—if indeed the vulgate text of that passage is not corrupt (see Jebb's n.). Nauck evidently attached no value to the scholium, which he omitted from his edition of the Fragments. There is, however, a further indication in the note, which can almost with certainty be assigned to Sophocles, and which increases the probability that we have here a rough outline of his plot. That is the statement that the alteration of the sun's course was due to the sun-god's horror at the impious feast. For this very thing is mentioned by Statyllius Flaccus in his epigram in honour of Sophocles (*A. P.* 9. 98): Οἰδίποδες δισσοί σε καὶ Ἠλέκτρη βαρύμηνις | καὶ δείπνοις ἐλαθεὶς Ἀτρέος Ἥλιος κτέ[1]. The same version was generally adopted by the Latin poets (see, besides Sen. *Thyest.* 785 ff., Ov. *Her.* 16. 205, *Am.* 3. 12. 39 *aversumque diem mensis furialibus Atrei*); but it is more important to observe that it also occurs in Hygin. *fab.* 88, which is connected with Sophocles for other reasons (see p. 185), and in *fab.* 258. For another tale was current according to which, after Thyestes by his treacherous and shameful plot had temporarily obtained recognition as monarch, Zeus promised to Atreus that the course of nature should be changed in his favour and that he might promise this marvel to the people as a token that he was the rightful heir (Apollod. *epit.* 2. 12). This was accepted by Euripides (fr. 861 δείξας γὰρ ἄστρων τὴν ἐναντίαν ὁδὸν | δήμους τ' ἔσωσα καὶ τύραννος ἰζόμην), and is apparently referred to by Sophocles in fr. 738, where see note. Hence Welcker (p. 361) was undoubtedly mistaken in referring it to some later tragedian. To later rationalists Atreus was an early astronomer: Strabo 23, Lucian *de astrol.* 12.

It seems clear that Aristotle's allusions to Thyestes in *poet.* 13. 1453[a] 10 etc., whether they relate to Sophocles or to Euripides, concern the banquet-play and not the story of Pelopia.

Welcker thought that Μυκηναῖοι should be restored as the alternative title. The evidence is very slight, but, if the feminine form is correct, it would follow that Aerope was one of the most prominent characters.

[1] The importance of this passage was first pointed out by O. Crusius in *Philol.* Suppl. VI 304 sq., but is overlooked by Escher in Pauly Wissowa II 2143, who refers to it. It is of course possible that the epigrammatist was simply alluding to the story of Atreus in the form most familiar to him.

140

μὰ τὴν ἐκείνου δειλίαν, ἣ βόσκεται,
θῆλυς μὲν αὐτός, ἄρσενας δ' ἐχθροὺς ἔχων.

140. 2 ἄρρενας (ἄρσενας N) codd.

140 Schol. Eur. *Hipp.* 307 *εἰώθασιν εἰρωνευόμενοι κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὀμνύναι, ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν* Μυκηναίαις (Μυκήναις AB) *'μὰ...ἔχων.'*

'Not so! by the cowardice that is his daily portion,—that man whose heart is a woman's, with men for his foes.' It is important to observe that v. 2 is subordinate to *βόσκεται*, for the main clause (express or implied) to which *μά* is attached must be negative. In *Hipp.* l.c. the negative clause is *μὴ μεθέξοντας δόμων* which depends directly upon *ἴσθι*: 'know that,—however stubbornly you contest it—if you die and abandon your children, they will never receive their inheritance, no! I swear by the Amazon' &c. The construction was correctly explained by Paley, but several editors strangely make *προδοῦσα* supplementary to *ἴσθι*, which could only mean 'know that you have abandoned'...—**βόσκεται**, as usual, implies a certain degree of contempt. Cf. fr. 591 *βόσκει δὲ τοὺς μὲν οἷπερ δυσαμερίας*. R. A. Neil, who examined the history of this word in an excellent note on Ar. *Eq.* 255, pointed out that it is generally metaphorical in tragedy. See also Cobet, *V. L.* p. 67.—**θῆλυς**, of a man: cf. *Trach.* 1075, Aesch. *Cho.* 304 *θήλεια γὰρ φρήν* (of Aegisthus, who is addressed as *γυνή* in *Ag.* 1625). The taunt is well illustrated by Eur. *Heclid.* 700 *αἰσχρὸν γὰρ οἰκούρημα γίγνεται τόδε, | τοὺς μὲν μάχεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ δειλίᾳ μένειν*. The parallel to Aegisthus is so close, that one may suspect that his father Thyestes is referred to. Ribbeck (p. 200) compared this fr. with Ennius *Thyest.* fr. v, where he supposes Thyestes to repudiate the charge of cowardice.

141

ἐπισπάσει

141 Hesych. II p. 168 *ἐπισπάσει· ἐπιτεύξεται.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἀτρεῖ ἢ Μυκήναις *ἐπὶ* (ἀπὸ Nauck) *τῶν τοῖς λίνοις λαμβανόντων.*

The use illustrated is the same as that found in *Ai.* 769 *πέποιθα τοῦτ' ἐπισπάσειν κλέος*, where see Jebb. The meaning is to *draw in*, as a fisherman secures his catch: cf. *A. P.* 6. 109 *καὶ κρυφίου τρίκλωστον ἐπισπαστῆρα βόλοιο*. Solon ap. Plut. *Sol.* 14 *περιβαλὼν δ' ἄγραν ἀγασθεὶς οὐκ ἐπέσπασεν μέγα | δίκτυον*. Soph. fr. 210. 40. Jebb's apology for the use of the active, that it is prompted by metrical considerations, is surely unnecessary. Though the middle naturally tended to assert itself, as the metaphorical meaning became increasingly familiar (see Wyttenbach on Plut. *mor.* p. 39 A), no objection can be taken to the active, at least so long as its original force remains prominent. The use of *φέρειν* (e.g. *El.* 692) is exactly similar.

ΑΧΑΙΩΝ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΟΣ

Until quite recently it was generally held that *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* and *Σύνδειπνοι* were alternative titles of the same play; but the reasons which appeared to support that conclusion will be more conveniently considered in connexion with the *Σύνδειπνοι*. The discovery of fr. 142 has entirely altered the conditions of the problem. The internal evidence of that fragment clearly indicates the story of the play to which it

belonged; and, since the language appears to be that of Sophocles, as is pointed out in the notes, the inference drawn by Wilamowitz that it comes from the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* can hardly be resisted[1]. Not only does no other title seem to fit the data, but the words in col. ii 12 *ποῦ 'στι σύλλογος φίλων ;* are a strong confirmation of the proposed identification. Also *ἐξετάζεται* in v. 17 may be compared with fr. 144.

The chief interest of the plot lay in the relations of Achilles with Telephus. When the Greeks first sailed to Troy, through ignorance of its real situation they landed in Mysia. Here Telephus, who was king of the country, came out to meet them, and killed Thersander the son of Polynices. But, fleeing before Achilles, he became entangled in a vine-plant, and was wounded by Achilles' spear. The Greeks retired, and were scattered by a storm; Achilles reached Scyros, where he ultimately married Deidamia. At length the confederates assembled for a second time at Argos. Meanwhile Telephus, whose wound refused to heal, had visited Delphi and learnt from the oracle that he could only be cured by the hand which had inflicted the wound (*ὁ τρώσας ἰάσεται* schol. Ar. *Nub.* 919). The sequel is described in Procl. *Cypr.* (*EGF* p. 19) *ἔπειτα Τήλεφον κατὰ μαντειαν παραγενομενον εἰς Ἄργος ἰᾶται Ἀχιλλεὺς ὡς ἡγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πλοῦ* : and more fully in Apollod. *epit.* 3. 19, 20 *συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν Ἄργει αὖθις μετὰ τὴν ῥηθεῖσαν ὀκταετίαν, ἐν ἀπορίᾳ τοῦ πλοῦ πολλῇ καθεστήκεσαν, καθηγεμόνα μὴ ἔχοντες, ὃς ἦν δυνατὸς δεῖξαι τὴν εἰς Τροίαν. Τήλεφος δε ἐκ τῆς Μυσίας, ἀνίατον τὸ τραῦμα ἔχων, εἰπόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοτε τευξεσθαι θεραπείας, ὅταν ὁ τρώσας ἰατρὸς γένηται, τρυχεσιν ἠμφιεσμένος εἰς Ἄργος ἀφίκετο, καὶ δεηθεὶς Ἀχιλλέως καὶ υπεσχημενος τὸν εἰς Τροίαν πλοῦν δεῖξαι θεραπεύεται ἀποξύσαντος Ἀχιλλέως τῆς Πηλιάδος μελίας τὸν ἰόν. θεραπευθεὶς οὖν ἔδειξε τὸν πλοῦν, τὸ τῆς δειξεως ἀσφαλὲς πιστουμένου τοῦ Κάλχαντος διὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μαντικῆς.*

The story of the healing of Telephus formed the subject of the famous play written by Euripides[2] under this title and produced in 438 B.C.; and the words *τρίχεσιν ἠμφιεσμένος* in Apollodorus appear to be due to Euripidean influence (cf. fr. 697, and Nauck, *TGF* p. 580). The ingenuity of the playwright, in handling the drama, was taxed to solve the dramatic difficulty of converting Telephus, a declared foe, into a trustworthy friend.

[1] Crusius (*Lit. Z.* 1907, 1310) did not altogether approve of the separation of the titles. He pointed out that the divergence of name was probably to be explained by the history of the fragments, and that their style is consistent with a single source.

[2] For reconstructions of Euripides' play from the existing material see Wilamowitz, *Berl. Klassikertexte* v 2 p. 69 f., and Starkie on Ar. *Ach.* p. 148 ff.

According to one account (Hygin. *fab.* 101), Telephus, in concert with Clytaemnestra, seized the child Orestes from his cradle before taking refuge at the altar, and threatened to kill him unless his prayer was granted. When the Berlin papyrus was first deciphered, Wilamowitz inferred from the reading Ὀρέστα in col. i 2 that the incident formed part of Sophocles' design, but, now that Schubart has restored παρέστα, the inference falls to the ground. It had already been argued by L. Pollak (*Zwei Vasen aus der Werkstatt Hierons*, Leipzig, 1900) from a vase-painting, which he refers to a date earlier than 470 B.C., that the Orestes-episode did not belong to the original version of the story given in the *Cypria*. On the vase Telephus has taken refuge at the altar: his right hand covers his wounded foot, and his left hand is stretched out in the direction of a warrior (Achilles) who has drawn his sword against him, while he looks for protection to a seer (Calchas) who is approaching on the right. Pollak's conclusion is entirely consistent with the statement of the schol. Ar. *Ach.* 332, attributing the Orestes-episode to Aeschylus. Nauck (*TGF* p. 76) regards the insertion of Aeschylus' name as a mere blunder, but, whereas most writers have agreed in supposing that the seizure of the child was introduced—if not for the first time—by Euripides, Wecklein (*Die dramatische Behandlung des Telephosmythus*, München, 1909, p. 16) has gone so far as to deny that it was mentioned by him at all, except possibly by way of criticizing Aeschylus. However this may be, there is no evidence connecting it with Sophocles, and it is more agreeable to his usual procedure to suppose that he adhered as closely as possible to the narrative of the κύκλος (Athen. 277 D). It is a fair inference that the action of the play took place at Argos, and the new fragment indicates that the reconciliation with the Greeks had already been achieved. The words σὲ γὰρ Τεγεᾶτις...ἁλίων ἐρετμῶν (col. ii 7—10) may be taken to show that the Greek origin of Telephus had been established, and that the Greeks had accepted him as their destined pilot to the Trojan coast in accordance with an oracle imparted to them by Calchas. We may compare Hyginus (*l.c.*): *Achivis autem quod responsum erat, sine Telephi ductu Troiam capi non posse, facile cum eo in gratiam redierunt et ab Achille petierunt, ut eum sanaret.* It remained only to satisfy the requirements of the oracle given to Telephus (ὁ τρώσας ἰάσεται), and for this purpose the words addressed by Odysseus to Achilles are significant—ἐν δέοντι δ' ἦλθες, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως. Odysseus was chosen for his discretion to negotiate with Achilles, who had not arrived at the beginning of the play (cf. fr. 144). We cannot tell how he gained his point, but it seems unlikely that the discovery

of Telephus' origin was the chief factor in persuading Achilles to give his assistance. The course of the subsequent *dénouement* is perhaps to be traced, as Wecklein (p. 20) suggests, in Hyginus: *quibus Achilles respondit se artem medicam non nosse. tunc Ulixes ait: non te dixit Apollo, sed auctorem vulneris hastam nominat. quam cum rasissent, remediatus est.*

The title was well known in antiquity, as appears from schol. BT on Hom. Θ 519 λέξασθαι...ὅθεν καὶ λογάδες καὶ σύλλογος Ἀχαιῶν. Wilamowitz argues that the date of composition must have been earlier than the production of Euripides' more complex play.

142

col. i

. . . . . π]αρέστα

desunt duo versus

. . . . .] . ει

. . . . . .

. . . . .]ι

. . . .

. . . . .]ν μὲν φυγάδες

. . . . .]ισκον

desunt cetera

col. ii

ἢ νότ[ου ἢ] ζεφύρ[ο]ιο δίνα
πέμ[ψει Τ]ρῳάδας ἀκτάς.

142. ii **1** δίνα Murray: δεινα pap.

142 *Berliner Klassikertexte* V 2 p. 64. The above fragments are taken from the upper part of a roll 14 cm. high and 19 cm. broad. The writing tends to assume a cursive form, and is stated to belong to the second century A.D. The first column was entirely occupied with the chorus which is concluded in col. ii.

Col. i 2 παρέστα was restored by Schubart. Wilamowitz at first read Ὀρέστα, deducing therefrom an important argument concerning the development of the plot which he subsequently abandoned. See Introductory Note.

Col. ii 1. On the assumption that some such word as αὔρα must have gone before, Wilamowitz suggested νῦν γὰρ στόλον ἁμὸν ἄελλα. He points out that the genitive in -οιο was not previously certified for Sophocles, although Φριγίοιο had been conjectured in *Ai.* 210. But it is probable that Murray's correction δίνα should be adopted: the same error was detected by Hermann in Aesch. *Pers.* 579. The objection that δίνα should mean an *edaying* wind is not maintainable; for swift rather than circular motion might have been expressed by it. Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 245 οὐράνιοί τε δῖναι νεφέλας δρομαίου.

σύ τε π[ηδ]αλίωι παρεδρεύ[ων]
φράσε[ις τῷ] κατὰ πρῶ<ι>ρα[ν]
εὐθὺς Ἰ[λίο]υ πόρον
Ἀτρει[δᾶν ἰ]δέσθαι.
σὲ γὰρ Τε[γ]εᾶτις ἡμῖν,
Ἑλλάς, οὐ[χ]ὶ Μυσία, τίκτει
ναύταν σύν τινι δὴ θεῶν
καὶ πεμπτῆρ' ἁλίων ἐρετμῶν.

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ μῶν καὶ σὺ καινὸς ποντίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς
ἥκεις, Ὀδυσσεῦ; ποῦ 'στι σύλλογος φίλων;
τί μέλλετ'; οὐ χρὴν ἥσυχον κεῖσθαι π[ό]δα.

ΟΔ. δοκεῖ στρατεύειν καὶ μέλει τοῖς ἐν τέλει
τάδ'· ἐν δέοντι δ' ἦλθες, ὦ παῖ Πηλέως.

6 Ἀτρειδᾶν scripsi : Ἀτρείδᾳ Wilamowitz

3 ff. If the restoration of Wilamowitz is adopted, it is remarkable that, in a passage where the functions of πρῳρεύς and κυβερνήτης are so sharply distinguished, Agamemnon should be identified with the former and described as subject to the orders of Telephus. Cf. Plut. *Agis* 1 οἱ πρῳρεῖς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν προορώμενοι τῶν κυβερνητῶν ἀφορῶσι πρὸς ἐκείνους καὶ τὸ προστασσόμενον ὑπ' ἐκείνων ποιοῦσιν. The look-out man was specially charged to watch for a change in the wind: Ar. *Eq.* 543 πρῳρατεῦσαι καὶ τοὺς ἀνέμους διαθρῆσαι. Was it likely that Agamemnon would undertake such a task? Nor do I think that the text is justified by the metaphorical use of πρῳράτης in fr. 524, 1, where see n. I hesitate therefore to accept Ἀτρείδᾳ in v. 6, and should prefer to substitute Ἀτρειδᾶν. It is worth notice that, although Ἀτρεῖδαι etc. occur in Sophocles more than 30 times, the singular is only found in *Ai.* 1349. For the metre, bacchiac dipody in place of Reizianum, see *e.g.* Eur. *Tro.* 321. I am also unable to agree with Wilamowitz in joining εὐθὺς Ἰλίου, which he compares with the isolated Eur. *Hipp.* 1157. It is simpler to give εὐθύς its usual meaning, and to treat Ἰλίου as an objective genitive: cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 108 πορθμὸν οὐκ ἤδεισθα πατρῴας χθονός; *I. T.* 1066 γῆς πατρῴας νόστος. Hom. ε 344 νόστου | γαίης Φαιήκων. So perhaps Ἰλίου στόλον Eur. *I.A.* 816 (England). There is no difficulty in the combination of such an objective genitive with the possessive: see *O.C.* 729, Eur. *Phoen.* 934 (n.). For ἰδέσθαι = *to look out for*, cf. *Ai.* 1165 σπεῦσον κοίλην κάπετόν τιν' ἰδεῖν. *Phil.* 467 πλοῦν μὴ 'ξ ἀπόπτου μᾶλλον ἢ 'γγύθεν σκοπεῖν. Eur. *Hec.* 901 μένειν ἀνάγκη πλοῦν ὁρῶνταs ἥσυχον. Plat. *legg.* 866 D σκηνησάμενος ἐν θαλάττῃ τέγγων τοὺς πόδας πλοῦν ἐπιφυλαττέτω.

7 Τεγεᾶτις. Sophocles also employed the form Τεγεάς (fr. 1100).

9 σύν τινι δὴ θεῶν: cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 167 ὅλβον, ὃν Δαρεῖος ἤρεν οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινός. Eur. *Phoen.* 1614 (ὥστε) ἄνευ θεῶν του ταῦτ' ἐμηχανησάμην.

10 πεμπτήρ is a new word.

11 ποντίας...χθονός, his island home of Ithaca. Wilamowitz points out that this use of πόντιος does not occur in Aesch. or Eur. and quotes *Phil.* 269 ποντίας Χρύσης. Pind. *Nem.* 8. 18 ποντίᾳ Κύπρῳ.

12 σύλλογος φίλων helps to identify the play. Cf. Eur. *I.A.* 1545 Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος στρατεύματος.

13 ἥσυχον...πόδα occurs also in Eur. *Bacch.* 647 στῆσον πόδ', ὀργῇ δ' ὑπόθες ἥσυχον πόδα, where however it has been much suspected, and in *Med.* 217 οἳ δ' ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς | δύσνοιαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥᾳθυμίαν.

14 τοῖς ἐν τέλει is another slight indication of Sophocles' authorship, since this phrase occurs four times in the extant plays, but nowhere in Euripides.

ΑΧΙΛΛ οὐ μὴν ἐπ' ἀκταῖς γ' ἐστὶ κωπήρης στρατός,
οὔτ' οὖν ὁπλίτης ἐξετάζεται παρών.

ΟΔ ἀλλ' αὐτίκα· σπεύδειν γὰρ ἐν καιρῷ χρεών.

ΑΧΙΛΛΕ αἰεί ποτ' ἐστὲ νωχελεῖς καὶ μέλλετε,
ῥήσεις θ' ἕκαστος μυρίας καθήμενος
λέγει, τὸ δ' ἔργον [οὐ]δαμοῦ πορεύεται.
κ[ἀγ]ὼ μέν, ὡς ὁρᾷ[τ]ε, δρᾶν ἕτοιμος ὢν
ἥ[κ]ω, στρατός τε Μ[υρ]μιδών, καὶ πλεύσ[ομαι]
[λιπ]ὼν Ἀτρείδα[ιν καὶ στρατοῦ] με[λ]λήμ[ατα].

22 ορα[.]κ pap.

16 οὐ μήν...γ' is adversative, (*yet... not*). *γε* never follows *μήν* immediately and sometimes the intervening word or words alone are emphasized: cf. *O. T.* 810 *οὐ μὴν ἴσην γ' ἔτεισεν*. See also on Eur. *Phoen.* 1622.—Wecklein objects to **κωπήρης στρατός**, requiring *στόλος* as in Aesch. *Pers.* 417, and would read *ἐκκεκώπευται στρατός* from fr. 145. The objection is hypercritical, and the proposed alteration would make *ὁπλίτης* in v. 17 unintelligible.

17 οὔτ' οὖν. Since the time of Elmsley scholars have generally agreed in condemning *οὔ...οὔτε* in parallel clauses, where it is given by the MSS of Attic writers (Kuehner-Gerth II 28. Jebb on *Trach.* 1058). Homer has received less stringent treatment: see Leaf on X 265. Wilamowitz argues that *οὔτ'* should be kept here, on the ground that where the first negative is strengthened, as here or by *τις, ποτ* or *τι, τε* may stand in the second clause. The suggested rule is questionable, but, when he says that *οὐδ'* would be impossible with *οὖν* following, he undoubtedly goes too far: cf. *O.C.* 1134 *οὔτε ἔγωγέ σε, οὐδ' οὖν ἐάσω*. In view of the many instances where *οὐδέ* has been corrupted to *οὔτε*, I should prefer (with Wecklein) to read *οὐδ'* here.—**ὁπλίτης**: *sc.* *στρατός*.

18 ἀλλά, introducing an objection: Kuehner-Gerth II 288. Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1618 (n.). Odysseus replies with a familiar tag, not far removed from our 'more haste, worse speed.' Cf. *Phil.* 637 *ἦ τοι καίριος σπουδὴ πόνου | λήξαντος ὄκνου κἀνάπαυλαν ἤγαγεν*. So in Eur. *Hel.* 718 *σπεύδων δ' ὅτ' ἔσπευδ' οὐδὲν εἶχε* is equivalent to *σπεύδων ἀκαίρως*.

19 νωχελεῖς: also in Eur. *Or.* 800 *πλευρὰ νωχελῆ νόσῳ*. Wilamowitz calls it an Ionism.

20 ῥήσεις, here of deliberative speeches; but the word never developed this as a technical sense. Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 623 *τοιάνδ' ἔπειθεν ῥῆσιν ἀμφ' ἡμῶν λέγων*. Achilles is the typical man of action, who finds debate trivial, and *ῥήσεις λέγειν* has the same slightly contemptuous force as the common *λόγους λέγειν* (Wilamowitz). —**καθήμενος**, inactive: so Dem. 2. 23 *ἀλλ' οἶμαι καθήμεθ' οὐδὲν ποιοῦντες*. *ib.* 24 *τὰ δ' ὑμέτερ' αὐτῶν ἀπολωλεκότες κἀθησθε*. 4. 9 *μέλλονται ἡμᾶς καὶ καθημένους περιστοιχίζεται*.

21 οὐδαμοῦ πορεύεται, 'in no degree (quarter) is forwarded.' The local sense of *οὐδαμοῦ* is transferred to the moral sphere (fr. 106 n.), but it has not become equivalent to *οὐδαμῶς*. So in Eur. *Her.* 841 *ἢ θεοί μὲν οὐδαμοῦ* and elsewhere, but in *O. T.* 908 the ordinary meaning is possible. The passive sense of *πορεύεσθαι* appears in *Ai.* 1254. Cf. fr. 314. 324.

22 *ὁρᾷς με* was printed in the *editio princeps*, but Schubart has since reported that the space is insufficient for that reading. It seems to follow that the insertion of *ι* was an error, and that *ὁρᾶτε* should be adopted, as proposed by Hunt.

24 is echoed in Eur. *I.A.* 818 *τὰ τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν μὴ μόνων μέλήματα*. This is not so much imitation as involuntary reminiscence, and there are several similar instances, such as *e.g.* Eur. *Med.* 513 *ἀλλ' ὥστε ναὸς κεδνὸν οἰακοστρόφον* after Aesch. *Theb.* 61 *σὺ δ' ὥστε ναὸς κεδνὸν οἰακοστρόφον*. For other examples see Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 135.

The metres of the choral ode present hardly any difficulty:—

– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑	– ⏑ – –	Alcaic. quatern. (enhopl.)
– – – ⏑	⏑ – –	pherecr.
⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	⏑ ⏑ – –	paroem. (enhopl.)
⏑ – – ⏑	⏑ – –	pherecr.
– ⏑ –	⏑ – ⏑ –	lecyth.
⏑ – –	⏑ – –	ba. ba.
⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –	⏑ – –	enhopl. Archil.
– ⏑ –	⏑ – ⏑ – – –	cr. ia. sp. (cf. *Ai.* 197, 400)
– – – ⏑	⏑ – ⏑ –	glycon.
– – – ⏑ ⏑	– ⏑ – –	Alcaic. quatern. (enhopl.)

col. iii

restant tantum personarum nominum hic illic vestigia, ita tamen ut *στιχομυθίαν* a versu undecimo usque ad vicesimum et fortasse latius pertinuisse ostendant

143

ὡς ναοφύλακες νυκτέρου ναυκληρίας
πλήκτροις ἀπευθύνουσιν οὐρίαν τρόπιν.

143 Pollux 10. 143 *ναυτικὰ δὲ σκεύη κάλοι...πηδάλια πλῆκτρα, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀχαιῶν συλλόγῳ 'ὡς...τρόπιν.'*

It is a mistake to suppose that the Greeks did not sail by night, seeing that the use of the stars for the purpose of navigation was attributed to Palamedes (fr. 432). But if the sky was clouded it was necessary to lay to, and the sailor's dread of night became proverbial. Aesch. fr. 193 (Cicero's tr.) *navem ut horrisono freto | noctem paventes timidi adnectunt navitae. Suppl.* 777 *φιλεῖ | ὠδῖνα τίκτειν νὺξ κυβερνήτῃ σοφῷ.* Theogn. 1375 *ὄλβιος ὅστις...οὐκ οἶδε θάλασσαν | οὐδὲ οἱ ἐν πόντῳ νὺξ ἐπιοῦσα μέλει.* Here the point of the comparison is lost, but we may guess that stress was laid upon the risk run by every sailor at night, even when wind (*οὐρίαν*) and weather were in his favour. Or it may be that the skill of the nocturnal pilot, and not the danger of his enterprise, was the chief motive of the simile. See Zenob. 5. 32 *οὐ νυκτιπλοεῖς: ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ ἀκριβῶς τι ποιούντων. ἡ γὰρ νὺξ ἀκριβεστέρα τῆς ἡμέρας τοῖς πελαγοδρομοῦσι, διὰ τὰς τῶν ἄστρων σημειώσεις. ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος ἀφελὼν τὴν 'οὐ' ἀπόφασιν 'νυκτιπλοεῖς' εἶπεν* (*Stoic. vet. fr.* III p. 202). Strabo 757: the Sidonians became skilled astronomers largely in consequence of their enterprise in nocturnal navigation.

1 ναυκληρίας. Campbell is probably right in concluding that the word is used here for a *ship*: see n. on Eur. *Hel.* 1519 *τίς δέ νιν ναυκληρία | ἐκ τῆσδ' ἀπῆρε χθονός;* But we must not lose sight of the possible alternative: 'pilots of a voyage by night.' There is in any case a pleonasm in the combination of *ναοφύλακες* and *ναυκληρίας*: see n. on Eur. *Phoen.* 1549 *πόδα τυφλόπουν.*

2 πλήκτροις is a synonym for the ordinary *πηδαλίοις*. They quote Hdt. 1. 194 *ἰθύνεται δὲ ὑπό τε δύο πλήκτρων, καὶ δύο ἀνδρῶν ὀρθῶν ἑστεώτων· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔσω ἕλκει τὸ πλῆκτρον, ὁ δὲ ἔξω ὠθέει.* Cf. Sil. Ital. 14. 401 *residentis puppe magistri | affixit plectro dextram.*

144

σὺ δ' ἐν θρόνοισι γραμμάτων πτυχὰς ἔχων
νέμ' εἴ τις οὐ πάρεστιν ὃς ξυνώμοσεν.

144. **1** *πτυχὰς* Toup: *πτύχας* codd. **2** *νέμ' εἴ τις* Bergk: *ἀπόνειμον νέμει τίς* codd. | *πάρεστιν ὃς* Bergk: *πάρεστι τίς* codd.

144 Schol. Pind. *Isth.* 2. 68 *τὸ γὰρ ἀπόνειμον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνάγνωθι. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀχαιῶν συλλόγῳ· 'σὺ δ' ἐν θρόνοισι γραμμάτων πτύχας ἔχων ἀπόνειμον νέμει τις οὐ πάρεστι τίς ξυνώμοσεν·' καὶ Παρθένιος ἐν τῇ Ἀρήτῃ τὸ ἄνειμε (ἄννεμε*

Valckenaer) *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνάγνωθι· καὶ ἀνείμη δωριστὶ <ὁ> βουκόλος* [referring to Theocr. 18. 47 f. *γράμματα δ' ἐν φλοιῷ γεγράψεται, ὡς παριών τις | ἀννειμη Δωριστὶ 'σέβου μ'· Ἑλένας φυτὸν εἰμί'*].

The fragment relates to a muster of the Achaean chiefs held immediately before their departure for Troy. The number present is to be ascertained by reference to a list of the suitors of Helen, who had joined in taking an oath to Tyndareus: *ὅτου γυνὴ γένοιτο Τυνδαρὶς κόρη, | τούτῳ συναμυνεῖν, εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων λαβὼν | οἴχοιτο* (Eur. *I.A.* 61). Cf. *Ai.* 1113, *Phil.* 72, Thuc. 1. 9, Hes. fr. 96, 40 ff. Rz. H. suggests that probably Achilles was found to be absent.

1 ἐν θρόνοισι. Welcker thought that the words were spoken by Odysseus to Agamemnon. However this may be, the person addressed appears to be seated on a high chair for the purpose of taking the roll: Agamemnon was *primus inter pares*, and is never treated as monarch of the Achaeans, so that a reference to his royalty would be out of place. For the Homeric *θρόνοι* see Ameis-Henze on α 132. Herwerden, thinking of a document kept in a place of security, proposed *ἐν δόμοισι*.—**πτυχάς**: here metre requires the accentuation which is now generally adopted. See Sandys on Eur. *Bacch.* 692. Cf. Eur. fr. 506, 2 *ἐν δέλτου πτυχαῖς | γράφειν τιν' αὐτά*.

2 νέμ' εἴ τις. The text of Pindar's scholiast is unfortunately corrupt, and the value of his testimony has been variously estimated. There is no doubt that some of the uses of *νέμω* and its compounds never passed into current Attic, and afterwards became obsolete. The scholiast argues that *ἀνόνειμον* in Pindar means 'read,' apparently on the ground that *νέμω* (cf. Hesych. III p. 147 *νέμει· ἀναγινώσκει. νέμεις· ἀναγινώσκεις. νέμω· ἀναγινώσκω*) and *ἀνανέμω* (cf. Epicharm. fr. 224 K.) are used in the same sense by other poets. In Theocritus *l.c.* the meaning—'to read' *to oneself* (strictly, perhaps, 'to con over' or 'spell out')—is certain, and we may believe that Parthenius (first century B.C.), a learned poet, is following some such authority. In Pindar most editors have refused to follow the scholiast, but Bury is inclined to adopt *ἀνάνειμον* with Tyrrell, who suggests for our line *ἀνάνειμον εἴ τις οὐ πάρ' ὃς ξυνώμοσεν*. But they have omitted to point out that the Greek for *recitare* or *recensere* is *ἀνανέμεσθαι*: Hdt. 1. 173 *εἰρομένου δὲ...τίς ἐστι, καταλέξαι ἑωυτὸν μητρόθεν καὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἀνανεμέεται τὰς μητέρας*. The schol. on Ar. *Av.* 1289 held that *ἀπενέμοντο* glanced at the meaning *ἀνεγίνωσκον*. To this should correspond *νέμεσθαι citare*, answering to *νέμειν* 'to mark off, put down, register,' which we find in the phrase *νέμειν προστάτην*: cf. Polyb. 6. 47. 8 *τῶν ἀθλητῶν τοὺς μὴ νενεμημένους*, 'unlicensed athletes.' So *κατανέμω* in Aeschin. 1. 155 *ἵνα ὑμεῖς κατανείμητε εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν τάξιν Τίμαρχον*, *ib.* 159. It is possible therefore that we should read *νεμῇ*, and make the sentence interrogative ('won't you call over...?'). But, on the whole, Bergk's *νέμ' εἴ τις* accounts better for the facts, and particularly for the interpolation of *ἀπόνειμον* (see cr. n.). We should render accordingly: 'mark off on your list any who are not present.' Madvig, who restored *νεμεῖς*, interpreted it similarly ('dinumerabis'). J., however, says of *νέμε*, 'it is simply "give us," *i.e.*, "let us hear."' So also Ellis, criticizing Campbell's rendering 'observe.'—**οὐ πάρεστιν**. These words are suggestive of a muster-roll: see Tucker on Aesch. *Cho.* 695 *παρούσαν ἐγγραφῇ* and Headlam in *C.R.* XVII 246.—**ὃς** (see cr. n.) seems to be a necessary correction, unless the corruption lies deeper. Tucker (*C.R.* XVII 190) proposed *ἀπόνεμε, τίς πάρεστι; τίς ξυνώμοσεν;* But that surely would be too abrupt.

145

ἐκκεκώπευται

145 Hesych. II p. 44 *ἐκκεκώπηται* (Musurus for *ἐκκεκόπηται*)· *ἐξήρτυται* (*ἐξήρτηται* codd.). *Σοφοκλῆς Συλλόγῳ Ἀχαιῶν συλλόγῳ* Musurus). Meineke restored *ἐκκεκώπευται*, referring to Hesych. II p. 460 *κεκώπευται στρατόν, ὁ ἐπὶ κώπῃ* and proposed *ἐξήρτυται <κώπαις>* to complete the gloss. Nauck thought that the simple verb *κεκώπευται* ought to be substituted, but the fondness of Sophocles for verbs compounded with *ἐκ* and with slightly intensive force makes

the suggestion unnecessary: see on fr. 524. Meineke thought that *κεκώπευται στρατός* was taken from a tragic poet, and so Wecklein. The question remains whether *ἐκκεκώπευται* meant 'is provided with oars,' or 'is equipped with weapons.' In favour of the latter, see on Eur. *Hel.* 1128 *μονόκωπος ἀνήρ* and cf. Timoth. *Pers.* 155 *σιδαρόκωπος Ἑλλάν*. But of course the other meaning, which Hesych. recognizes (II p. 460 *κεκώπηται· ἠ ναῦς*), is perfectly legitimate, if required by the context. See also Boeckh, *Urkunden*, p. 291, who gives from an inscription *τῶν ζυγῶν κεκώπηνται* Γ.

146

ἐπιξενοῦσθαι

146 Hesych. II p. 162 *ἐπιξενοῦσθαι· μαρτύρεσθαι, πορεύεσθαι. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀχαιῶν συλλόγῳ καὶ Αἰσχύλος Κρήσσαις* (fr. 120).

The inference to be drawn is that in one of the passages cited *ἐπιξενοῦσθαι* was equivalent to *μαρτύρεσθαι*, and in the other to *πορεύεσθαι*. For the first (=*to demand good offices*), which arises from the host becoming bail (so to speak) for his guest to his fellow-countrymen, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1319 *ἐπιξενοῦμαι ταῦτα δ' ὡς θανουμένῃ*. *ξεινοδόκος* and *ξεινοδοκεῖν* are said to have been used for *μάρτυς* and *μαρτυρεῖν* by Simonides or Pindar: see Apollon. *lex. Hom. s.v.* and *Etym. M.* p. 610, 42. The other meaning is apparently *to be on one's travels*, or *to sojourn abroad*. It occurs in Isocr. *ep.* 6 *τὸ μὴ πρέπειν ἐπιξενοῦσθαι τοῖς τηλικούτοις*, Arist. *pol.* 4 (7). 6. 1327^{a} 13, *Etym. M.* p. 470, 47, and is based upon the phrase *ἐπὶ ξένης εἶναι*, for which see *O. C.* 184, 563, Eur. *Andr.* 135.

147

ἐπισειούσης

147 Hesych. II p. 167 *ἐπισειούσης· ἐπικελευομένης. ἀπὸ τῶν τὰς ἡνίας ἐπιχαλώντων* (*ἐπιχαλέντων* cod.: corr. Musurus, *χαλώντων* Naber). *Σοφοκλῆς Ἀχαιῶν συλλόγῳ*.

The action of a driver encouraging his team by slackening the reins and shaking them over the horses' backs is familiar to everyone: see *El.* 711 *οἱ δ' ἅμα ἵπποις ὁμοκλήσαντες ἡνίας χεροῖν | ἔσεισαν*, Eur. *I. A.* 151 *πάλιν εἰσόρμα, σεῖε χαλινούς*. The transition from *ἐπισείειν ἡνίας* to *ἐπισείειν τινά* is illustrated by Eur. *Or.* 255 *μὴ 'πίσειέ μοι | τὰς αἱματωπούς καὶ δρακοντώδεις κόρας*, *ib.* 613. The coincidence of the latter with *ἐπισίζειν* is accidental.

148

ξυμβόλους

148 Hesych. III p. 172 *ξυμβόλους· τοὺς διὰ τῶν πταρμῶν οἰωνισμοὺς ἔλεγον. ἀνετίθεντο δὲ οὗτοι Δήμητρι. τινὲς δὲ τὰς διὰ τῆς φήμης γινομένας μαντείας, ἃς Φιλόχορός φησι* (*FHG* I 416) *Δήμητρα εὑρεῖν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἀχαιῶν συλλόγῳ* (*σύλλογον* cod.). The first part of the gloss recurs in Phot. *lex.* p. 311, 1, Suid. *s.v. ξυμβόλους*.

ξύμβολος, properly an adjective to *οἰωνός* in the wider sense, was the name given to anything capable of significance as an omen which a man might encounter in moving from place to place. Aesch. *Prom.* 502 *κληδόνας τε δυσκρίτους | ἐγνώρισ' αὐτοῖς ἐνοδίους τε συμβόλους*. Ar. *Av.* 719 *ὄρνιν τε νομίζετε πάνθ' ὅσαπερ περὶ μαντείας διακρίνει· | φήμη γ' ὑμῖν ὄρνις ἐστί, πταρμὸν τ' ὄρνιθα καλεῖτε, | ξύμβολον ὄρνιν, φωνὴν ὄρνιν, θεράποντ'*

ὄρνιν, ὄνον ὄρνιν. There the schol. gives a definition: ξύμβολον ὄρνιν φησίν, ἐπειδὴ συμβόλους ἐποίουν τοὺς πρῶτα ξυναντῶντας, καὶ ἐξ ἀπαντήσεώς τι προσημαίνοντας, and then proceeds in words identical with the first part of Hesychius' note. In Xen. *mem.* 1. 1. 3 it is implied that σύμβολοι are derived from οἱ ἀπαντῶντες. Several instances are given in Hor. *Carm.* 3. 27. 1 ff. So, to stumble on leaving the house was ill-omened: Tibull. 1. 3. 19. The eagles and the hare are called δδιον τέρας as σύμβολα in Aesch. *Ag.* 104. It will be observed that Hesych. and the schol. Ar. call πταιμός a case of σύμβολος, although Aristophanes keeps them apart, and that Hesych. seems to identify φήμη and σύμβολος, although all the ancient authorities distinguish them. The explanation is that the classes into which omens are divided are not mutually exclusive. A speech (φήμη) might be at once ominous in itself, and also σύμβολος if addressed to or heard by the person whose fortunes are affected.

ΑΧΙΛΛΕΩΣ ΕΡΑΣΤΑΙ

This was a satyr-play, as fr. 153 proves. It is probable that the satyrs were themselves represented as unsuccessful lovers of Achilles, and as filled with indignation in consequence. Wilamowitz thinks that Achilles was the pattern of the Athenian παῖς καλός, and that Phoenix (see fr. 153) was his παιδαγωγός[1]. Another character appearing was Peleus (fr. 150), who may have warned Achilles that the sports of his boyhood must soon be exchanged for the life of a warrior (fr. 156). Welcker inferred that the scene of the play was laid in the home of Peleus at Phthia, but the cave of Chiron on Mt Pelion is a much more likely haunt of satyrs, and is clearly indicated by the language of fr. 154. It was moreover in the cave of Chiron that Heracles met Achilles and fell a victim to his beauty. The story was related by Antisthenes in his well-known work entitled *Heracles* (Eratosth. *catasterism.* 40 p. 264 West., Procl. in. Plat. *Alc.* 1 p. 98 Cr.), and was doubtless taken by him from older sources: cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5. 381 ff. It may therefore be conjectured with some confidence that the arrival of Heracles was an episode in Sophocles. There is some authority for reckoning Chiron himself as a lover of Achilles (Dio Chrys. 58. 4 II p. 130 Arn.); but that tradition is less likely to be early. The case of Patroclus must be left doubtful. Aeschylus in the *Myrmidons* (*TGF* p. 44) represented Achilles as the ἐραστής, and is followed by many late authors (*e.g.* Philostr. *epist.* 8, Martial 11. 43. 10). But Plato in *Symp.* 180 A rebukes Aeschylus as guilty of a perverse error on the ground that Homer makes Patroclus the elder (Λ 787), and does not hesitate to call Patroclus the ἐραστής: so also Aristarchus (p. 187 Lehrs). No inference should be drawn from *Phil.* 434.

[1] Observe that, according to Apollod. 3. 175, Phoenix was cured of his blindness by Chiron. Wagner suggests that this may have been the motive of the presence both of Peleus and of Phoenix.

It is generally admitted that the play of Sophocles is referred to by Ov. *Trist.* 2. 409 *est et in obscenos commixta tragoedia risus,* | *multaque praeteriti verba pudoris habet.* | *nec nocet auctori, mollem qui fecit Achillem,* | *infregisse suis fortia facta modis.*

149

τὸ γὰρ νόσημα τοῦτ' ἐφίμερον κακόν·
ἔχοιμ' ἂν αὐτὸ μὴ κακῶς ἀπεικάσαι.
ὅταν πάγου φανέντος αἰθρίου χεροῖν
κρύσταλλον ἁρπάσωσι παῖδες εὐπαγῆ,
τὰ πρῶτ' ἔχουσιν ἡδονὰς ποταινίους·
τέλος δ' ὁ χυμὸς οὔθ' ὅπως ἀφῇ θέλει,
οὔτ' ἐν χεροῖν τὸ πῆγμα σύμφορον μένειν.

149. **1** τὸ γὰρ νόσημα Dobree: ἔρωτος γὰρ νόσημα SMA, νόσημ' ἔρωτος cod. Paris. 1985 | ἐφίμερον Arsenius: ἐφήμερον codd. [quod tamen Hense silentio negare videtur] **3** χεροῖν cod. Paris. 1985: χερσὶν SMA **4** παῖδες εὐπαγῆ Campbell: παιδιαῖσαγῆ S, παιδιαῖς ἄγη (ἄγγ A) MA, παῖδες ἀσταγῆ Salmasius, παιδιᾶς χάριν Blaydes, παῖδες εὐαγῆ Elter **5** ποταινίους cod. Paris. 1985: ποτ' ἐνίους SMA **6** sq. corrupta: v. infra | ὅτως M **7** πῆγμα Gomperz: κτῆμα S, κτῆμ' ἀσύμφορον MA | fort. μένει

149 Stob. *flor.* 64. 13 (IV p. 460, 7 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς. 'ἔρωτος γὰρ...προΐεται.' There is an allusion to the passage in Zenob. 5. 58 (*Paroem.* I p. 144): ὁ παῖς τὸν κρύσταλλον· ἐπὶ τῶν μήτε κατέχειν δυναμένων μήτε μεθεῖναι βουλομένων ἢ παροιμία εἴρηται. μέμνηται αὐτῆς Σοφοκλῆς Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς. Cf. Plut. *de garrul.* 12 p. 508 D ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες τὸν κρύσταλλον οὔτε κατέχειν οὔτ' ἀφιέναι θέλουσι.

1 The reading of the MSS (see cr. n.) appears to be due to the intrusion of a gloss. The cod. Paris. (Gaisford's B) is as usual interpolated.—Nauck retains ἐφήμερον, which is flat: he formerly proposed ἀνήμερον from Mosch. 1. 10. J. thought ἐφίμερον clearly right—'an attractive evil, but an evil still.' There is probably an allusion to Sappho's description of Love as γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον (fr. 40): cf. *Anth. Pal.* 5. 133, Plut. *qu. conv.* 5. 7. 2 p. 681 B ἡδονῆς ἀλγηδόνι μεμιγμένης, ἣν αὐτοὶ γλυκύπικρον ὀνομάζουσιν, Theogn. 1353 πικρὸς καὶ γλυκύς ἐστι καὶ ἁρπαλέος καὶ ἀπηνής (ἔρως).

2 The asyndeton is unusual and has provoked suspicion. Blaydes conjectured ἔχοιμ' ἂν αὐτὸ δ' οὐ κακῶς (or ἔχοιμι δ' αὖτ' ἂν μὴ κακῶς). This is better than Nauck's ἔχοιν δ' ἄν, adopted by Meineke. In the next line the asyndeton of the explanation (Kuehner-Gerth II 344) is natural.—μὴ κακῶς go together, like μὴ κακὴ in *Trach.* 722.

3 αἰθρίου: see on fr. 117. Blaydes would import χυθέντος from *Phil.* 293.

4 ἀσταγῆ, *i.e.*, 'not trickling,' hard-frozen. 'The only objection to this reading arises from the ordinary use of ἄστακτος, etc., as = "not *merely* trickling," —"gushing" or "streaming." Eur. *I. T.* 1242 ἀστάκτων μάτηρ ὑδάτων. *O. C.* 1646 ἀντακτί (Plat. *Phaed.* 117 C). Ap. Rh. 3. 804 τὰ δ' (tears) ἔρρεεν, ἀσταγὲς αὖτως.' (J.)—With Hense I accept Campbell's εὐπαγῆ, which was independently proposed by Nauck.

5 τὰ πρῶτα adv., as in fr. 966.—ποταινίους, *novas*, as in *Ant.* 849, Aesch. *Prom.* 102.

6 f. It is generally recognized that these lines are corrupt, although no satisfactory remedy has been produced. J. was inclined to accept Meineke's κρυμός for χυμός, comparing fr. 507 and Eur. fr. 682, 3, but in other respects to defend the text. He construed οὔθ'...θέλει as 'will not consent to one's letting it go,' with an ellipse of τις as in *El.* 697 (n.). But, even if παῖς were the subject, ὅπως ἀφῇ in place of ἀφιέναι after θέλει would be quite impossible Greek: there is no analogy to the examples collected in

οὕτω δὲ τοὺς ἐρῶντας αὐτὸς ἵμερος
δρᾶν καὶ τὸ μὴ δρᾶν πολλάκις προσίεται.

8 οὕτω δὲ (οὕτω γε Gesner) Meineke: οὔτε SMA 9 προσίεται Meineke: προΐεται codd.

Goodw. § 572, or more fully by Hale in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* XXIV 158. For this reason Meineke suggested οὐ' ἀφίεσθαι θέλει and Kock τέλος δὲ κρυμοῖς οὐθ' ὁ παῖς ἀφιέναι οὐτ'...συμφέρειν θέλει. Similar suggestions are Apelt's οὐτ' ἀπεστράφθαι θέλει, Hense's οὐτ' ἀπωσθῆναι θέλει, and Gomperz's οὐτ' ἀποσπᾶσθαι θέλει. Blaydes argued that Zenobius' μεθεῖναι βουλομένων pointed to οὐθ' ὅπως μεθῇς ἑᾷ or οὐτ' ἐᾷ μεθιέναι. Herwerden thought that some words must have fallen out: ὁ κρυμὸς <οὐκ ἀνασχετὸς πέλει | δίωκε δ' ὁ παίζων> κτέ. H. (in *C. R.* XVII 293) preferred that the first line should run τέλος δ' ἔχει νιν οὐθ' ὁ παῖς ὅπως ἀφῇ, or τέλος δ' ὅπως ἀφῇ νιν οὐθ' ὁ παις ἔχει, holding rightly that ἔχει is demanded by the construction. He points out that the indirect deliberative and the infinitive after ἔχει are combined by Sophocles in *Ai.* 428, *Ant.* 271. There are two objections to this view (1) that the change to the singular (ὁ παῖς) is awkward, and (2) that ἔχει does not fit the following line. With Dobree's θυμός (for χυμός) in the sense of 'desire,' we might continue οὐθ' ὅπως ἀφῇ σφ' ἔχει, treating v. 7 as a separate clause (*scil.* ἐστίν). But it has also occurred to me that the corruption may have been from an original τέλος δ' ὁ χυμὸς οὐχ ὅπως ἀφίεται, οὐθ' κτέ. It is true that in prose, where the idiom chiefly occurs, ἀλλ' οὐδ invariably introduces the second clause; but *El.* 796 shows that Sophocles did not shrink from using οὐχ ὅπως, and there is not sufficient evidence of early usage to prove that ἀλλ' οὐκ)(οὐδέ was indispensable in the apodosis. With συμφορὰν κ. ἐστί: but I cannot help suspecting that σύμφορον here meant *go well together* (cf. Xen. *Cyneg.* 8, 1 οὐδ' ἐὰν πνεῦμα ᾖ μέγα· συμφορὸν γὰρ τὴν χιόνα ἀφαιρεῖται [*i.e.* τὰ ἴχνη]. Pisides ap. Suid. s.v. συμφορά: ἐκ τῆς ἀμέτρου συμφορᾶς τῶν σταμάδων —περὶ χιόνος); and in that case μένει would be required. The conjecture πῆγμα (for κτῆμα), proposed by Gomperz and adopted by Nauck, is particularly attractive in this connexion. Blaydes, on the other hand, recommended πρᾶγμ' ἀσύμφορον κρατεῖν.

9 δρᾶν...προσίεται. 'And thus desire often pleads with lovers at once to go on loving and to abandon their love.' So J., who remarks that δρᾶν=ἐρᾶν, as ἐρῶντας indicates (Martin conj. ἐρᾶν τε καὶ μή: so Kock with τοὺς ἠβῶντας ἄλγος ἱμέρου preceding). For the use of δρᾶν in place of a repetition of the leading verb see on Eur. *Phoen.* 516. προσίεται, when used in the sense of 'attracts' or 'wins over,' does not appear elsewhere to be accompanied by an infinitive, but follows the analogy of such verbs as πείθω and προτρέπω. For the use of the articular infinitive as complement (δρᾶν καί τι μὴ δρᾶν Meineke), where the simple infinitive would be expected, an idiom characteristic of Sophocles, cf. *Trach.* 545 τὸ δ' αὖ ξυνοικεῖν τῇδ' ὁμοῦ τίς ἂν γυνὴ | δύναιτο; *Ant.* 78 τὸ δὲ | βίᾳ πολιτῶν δρᾶν ἔφην ἀμήχανον, *ib.* 1106 μόλις μέν, καρδίας δ' ἐξίσταμαι | τὸ δρᾶν, *Phil.* 1252 ἀλλ' οὐδέ τοι σῇ χειρὶ πείθομαι τὸ δρᾶν. For the co-ordination of the simple infinitive with the articular in the same clause cf. *El.* 265 κἀκ τῶνδέ μοι | λαβεῖν θ' ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ τηρᾶσθαι πέλει, *inf.* fr. 188 n. For the adverbial use of αὐτὸς (=*at once*) cf. *Phil.* 119, 1330. H. conjectured τοῦ γ' ἐρῶντος in v. 8 (*f. l.* XXIII 2721), and, if that were accepted, the use of προσίεται would be parallel to Eur. fr. 893.

The following rendering is taken from J. (with slight modifications): 'This distemper is a joy mixed with pain. Here is no bad image of it;—when the frost hath come in bright weather, and children seize a solid lump of ice, at first they feel a new delight; but at last the melting mass cannot be dropped, and yet their treasure will not rest packed firmly in their hands. Even thus desire often urges lovers at once to persevere and to desist.' Love, J. adds, is the piece of ice, beautiful at first sight, which cleaves to the soul that has once admitted it; and at the same time causes such pain that the lover often wishes that he were freed from it.

150

τίς γάρ με μόχθος οὐκ ἐπεστάτει; λέων
δράκων τε, πῦρ, ὕδωρ.

1 *ἐπεζάρει* coni. Herwerden **2** *ὕδωρ <τε>* coni. Mekler

150 Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 3. 60 *διωκομένη γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* (*i.e.* Thetis by Peleus) *μετέβαλλε τὰς μορφὰς ὁτὲ μὲν εἰς πῦρ, ὁτὲ δὲ εἰς θηρία· ὃ δὲ καρτερήσας περιγέγονε. περὶ δὲ τῆς μεταμορφώσεως αὐτῆς καὶ Σοφυκλῆς φησὶν ἐν Τρωίλῳ* (fr. 618) *καὶ ἐν 'Αχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς 'τίς γάρ...ὕδωρ.'*

1 f. τίς...οὐκ=πᾶς: see on fr. 959. 4.—**ἐπεστάτει.** If the reading is correct, we are obliged to assume that *ἐπιστατεῖν* is used in a sense otherwise unexampled (=*to beset, visit*), but corresponding to that of *ἐπιστῆναι* (*Trach.* 1170 *μόχθων τῶν ἐφεστώτων ἐμοί*, *O. T.* 777 *πρὶν μοι τύχη τοιάδ' ἐπέστη*); and that it is followed by an accusative of the person attacked on the analogy of such cases as *O. C.* 942 *οὐδείς ποτ' αὐτοὺς...ἂν ἐμπέσοι ξῆλος*. Otherwise the best correction is Herwerden's *ἐπεζάρει* (Eur. *Phoen.* 45 n.); but, as the metre is not entirely satisfactory, Nauck, who formerly proposed *ἐπεστρατεύετο*, suggests *τίς γάρ με <τίς με>...ἐπεζάρει;*—**λέων** *κτέ.* For the metamorphoses of Thetis in her struggle to escape from Peleus see on fr. 618. The particulars here given correspond to Pind. *Nem.* 4. 62 *πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲς θρασυμα|χάνων τε λεόντων | ὄνυχας ὀξυτάτους ἀκμὰν | καὶ δεινοτάτων σχάσαις ὀδόντων | ἔγαμεν κτέ.*, and to Apollod. 3. 170 *γινομένην δὲ ὁτὲ μὲν πῦρ ὁτὲ δὲ ὕδωρ ὁτὲ δὲ θηρίον*. Jebb on *Trach.* 10 remarks that similar powers of transformation are ascribed to other sea-gods, such as Nereus and Proteus; and that they must be taken to symbolize the unstable character of the element.

151

[*ἡ Θέτις ὑπὸ Πηλέως λοιδορηθεῖσα κατέλιπεν αὐτόν.*]

151 Schol. Ap. Rh. 4. 816 *Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν 'Αχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς φησὶν ὑπὸ Πηλέως λοιδορηθεῖσαν τὴν Θέτιν καταλιπεῖν αὐτόν.* The extract is repeated in schol. Ar. *Nub.* 1068.

Dindorf should not have combined this notice with fr. 150. It is interesting to find the story of the quarrel between Peleus and Thetis vouched for by Sophocles; but he is not the oldest authority, as it is said to have been described in the epic *Aegimius* (fr. 2 K.: see Bethe in Pauly-Wissowa 1 963). The schol. on Apoll. Rhod. *u.s.*, giving the epic version, says that Thetis used to test whether Peleus's children were immortal by plunging them into a cauldron of water; and that this proved fatal several times. When it was the turn of Achilles, Peleus stopped her. So Lycophr. 178, who makes Achilles the seventh child, *ἀφ' ἑπτὰ παίδων φεψάλῳ σποδουμένων | μοῦνον φλέγουσαν ἐξαλύξαντα σποδόν*. Here it will be observed that the child is burnt in the fire, not thrown into the water; and this is the usual version. Other authorities say nothing about the elder children: Apollod. 3. 171 *ὡς δὲ ἐγέννησε Θέτις ἐκ Πηλέως βρέφος, ἀθάνατον θέλουσα ποιῆσαι τοῦτο, κρύφα Πηλέως εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐγκρύβουσα τῆς νυκτὸς ἔφθειρεν· ὃ ἦν αὐτῷ θνητὸν πατρῷον, μεθ' ἡμέραν δὲ ἔχριεν ἀμβροσίᾳ. Πηλεὺς δὲ ἐπιτηρήσας καὶ σπαίροντα τὸν παῖδα ἰδὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐβόησε· καὶ Θέτις κωλυθεῖσα τὴν προαίρεσιν τελειῶσαι, νήπιον τὸν παῖδα ἀπολιποῦσα πρὸς Νηρηίδας ᾤχετο.* In Apoll. Rhod. 4. 783 ff. Hera pleads with Thetis to afford good passage for the Argo: she had given Thetis the best of mortals for a husband, and held up the wedding-torch with her own hand; moreover, it is fated that in the Elysian plain Medea shall be wedded to Achilles, 'who is now being tended by Naiads in the home of Chiron, though he longeth for thy milk: help, then, thy future daughter, and Peleus himself; why is thy wrath so firmly rooted?' Thetis accordingly

(851 ff.) appears to Peleus, and gives him certain directions, but warns him not to disclose her presence to his companions. *νόῳ δ' ἔχε, μή με χολώσῃς | πλεῖον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν ἀπηλεγέως ἐχόλωσας* (863 f.). Then she leaves him in great distress, for he had never seen her since she left his wedded couch in anger, when Achilles was still an infant. *ἡ μὲν γὰρ βροτέας αἰεὶ περὶ σάρκας ἔδαιεν | νύκτα διὰ μέσσην φλογμῷ πυρός· ἤματα δ' αὖτε | ἀμβροσίῃ χρίεσκε τέρεν δέμας, ὄφρα πέλοιτο | ἀθάνατος, καί οἱ στυγερὸν χροΐ γῆρας ἀλάλκοι. | αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἐξ εὐνῆς ἀναπάλμενος εἰσενόησεν | παῖδα φίλον σπαίροντα διὰ φλογός· ἧκε δ' ἀυτὴν | σμερδαλέην ἐσιδών, μέγα νήπιος· ἡ δ' ἀίουσα | τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἁρπάγδην χαμάδις βάλε κεκληγῶτα, | αὐτὴ δὲ πνοιῇ ἰκέλη δέμας, ἠύτ' ὄνειρος, | βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐκ μεγάροιο θοῶς, καὶ ἐσήλατο πόντον | χωσαμένη· μετὰ δ' οὔτι παλίσσυτος ἵκετ' ὀπίσσω.* There are two or three touches here, which show that Apollonius and Apollodorus are following the same original. The schol. on Ar. *Nub.* 1068 seems to be conflating two different stories. It is obvious that the burning of Achilles in the fire is a doublet of the better-known legend of Demeter and Demophon, the brother of Triptolemus: see Hom. *h. Dem.* 231 ff., with Allen and Sikes's n. on 239. These stories have recently been explained as recording a rite of infant initiation, whereby the child's hold on life is supposed to be strengthened: see W. R. Halliday in *C. R.* XXV 8 ff.

152

ἢ δορὸς διχόστομον πλᾶκτρον·
δίπτυχοι γὰρ ὀδύναι μιν ἤρικον
Ἀχιλληίου δόρατος.

152. **2** sq. *νιν ἤρεικον* Ἀχιλλεΐου Bergk (*ἤρεικον* iam L. Dindorf)

152 Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 6. 85 *οὐκ ἐκ παραδρομῆς δὲ ζάκοτον εἶπε τὸ δόρυ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως...ἀλλ' ὅτι ἰδιαίτερον παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα κατεσκεύαστο. δίκρουν γὰρ ὥστε δύο αἰχμὰς ἔχειν καὶ μιᾷ βολῇ [ὥστε] δισσὰ τὰ τραύματα ἀπεργάζεσθαι. καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Νηρεΐσι* (fr. 152) '*κάμακος εἶσι κάμακος γλώσσημα διπλάσιον.*' *καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς* '*ἢ...δόρατος.*'

It is generally admitted that something is wrong with the tradition, and that the text exhibits a conflation of two fragments, the first of which ends at *πλᾶκτρον*. The difficulty was first observed by Heath, who claimed v. 1 as alone belonging to Sophocles. Dobree, however (according to Nauck: for I cannot trace the source of his statement), denied that any part of the quotation was Sophoclean. Bergk came to the same conclusion as Heath; but thought that vv. 2, 3 did not belong to another play of Sophocles such as the Μυσοί—for so the reference to Telephus might suggest—but derived from a lyric source. Accordingly he prints them as fr. 95 of his *adespota* (*PLG* III 720). Hermann on Eur. *I. T.* 210 was of the same opinion as Dobree.

The tradition relating to the double point of Achilles' spear does not seem to be recorded except in the passages quoted by the scholiast, viz. Aesch. fr. 152 and the *Little Iliad* (*EGF* p. 41) fr. 5.

1 **πλᾶκτρον**, any striking instrument, whether *pointed* as here, or not: cf. Eur. *Alc.* 128 *διόβολον πλῆκτρον πυρὸς κεραυνίου.* (For the form of the thunderbolt see the representation given in *C. R.* XVII 276.) Ar. *Av.* 759 *αἶρε πλῆκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ*, of the cock's spur.

2 **δίπτυχοι** does not occur elsewhere in Sophocles: see on Eur. *Phoen.* 1354.—**μιν** is banished from tragedy by most critics, at any rate from dialogue: see *Trach.* 388, Aesch. *Eum.* 634, Eur. *Andr.* 1136. Some still maintain it in lyrics: Tucker on Aesch. *Cho.* 620, *Theb.* 440. The fluctuation of the scribes is undoubted, and scholars are divided on the question whether *νιν* should be replaced everywhere in Pindar. The papyrus of the *Paeans* (see 6. 115) shows that the doubt existed at an early date. Bacchylides has *μιν* only at 10. 111.—**ἤρικον** is intransitive in Hom. P 295 *ἤρικε δ' ἱπποδάσεια κόρυς περὶ δουρὸς ἀκωκῇ*, and has consequently been altered to *ἤρεικον* (see cr. n.), perhaps rightly. But *διήρικον* is transitive in Euphorion 40 *πλευρά τε καὶ θώρηκα διήρικεν ἰνίου ἄχρις*, and in Alex. Aetol. ap. Parthen. 14 *διὰ μὲν καλὸν ἤρικον οὖσον.*

153

παπαῖ, τὰ παιδίχ', ὡς ὁρᾷς, ἀπώλεσας.

153 *ὁρῶ σ' anecd.* Bachm., *ὁρῶσ' anecd. Par.* | *ἀπώλεσαν anecd.* Bachm.

153 Schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 1021 = Phot. *lex.* p. 369, 4 *παιδικά· ἐπὶ θηλειῶν καὶ ἀρρένων ἐρωμένων τάττεται ἡ λέξις...καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἀχιλλέως δ' ἐρασταῖς δῆλον ὡς οὕτως* (*scil.* *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρρένων*) *ἐξείληπται. ἐπιδόντων γάρ τι τῶν σατύρων εἰς τὴν γυναικείαν ἐπιθυμίαν φησὶν ὁ Φοῖνιξ 'παπαῖ...ἀπώλεσας.'* See also Suid. *s.v.*, Bachm. *anecd.* I p. 324, 16, Cramer *anecd. Par.* IV p. 173, 9.

When the satyrs inclined towards the love of women, Phoenix taunted them with treating their necessity as if it were a matter of choice.—**παπαῖ** here expresses scorn: more often it is used for simple astonishment, as in Plat. *leggs.* 704 C *παπαῖ οἷον λέγεις* = 'you don't say so!' Eur. *Cycl.* 572 *παπαῖ, σοφόν γε τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου.*—Blaydes conjectured *ὧν ἐρᾷς* for **ὡς ὁρᾷς.**

154

σὺ δ', ὦ Σύαγρε, Πηλιωτικὸν τρέφος

154 *βρέφος* Athenaei C, Eustath.

154 Athen. 401 D *Σοφοκλῆς μὲν γὰρ ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς ἐπὶ κυνὸς ἔταξε τοῦνομα* (*scil.* *σύαγρος*) *ἀπὸ τοῦ σῦς ἀγρεύειν, λέγων 'σὺ δ'...τρέφος.'* Eustath. *Od.* p. 1872, 12 *Σοφοκλῆς 'σὺ δ'...βρέφος.'* From Athen. also are drawn the statements in Gramm. Herm. p. 320 and *anecd. Par.* IV p. 245, 20 (A. Kopp, *Beitr. zur gr. Excerpten-Litt.* p. 159).

Πηλιωτικόν. In fr. 1069 Achilles is referred to as hunting on Mt Pelion, and it is highly probable that the allusion is to this play. It was in his cave on Mt Pelion that Achilles was reared by Chiron after he was abandoned by his mother (fr. 151): see Eratosth. *catast.* 40. A curious coincidence with the account in Apollodorus (3. 171) may be noted: *ὁ δὲ* (*scil.* *Χείρων*) *λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἔτρεφε σπλάγχνοις λεόντων καὶ συῶν ἀγρίων καὶ ἄρκτων μυελοῖς καὶ ὠνόμασεν Ἀχιλλέα κτέ.* In the well-known description of Pindar (*Nem.* 3. 43—52) we find *κάπρους τ' ἔναιρε*, but also that the speed of Achilles was such that he slew stags *ἄνευ κυνῶν.* Nauck thinks that Steph. Byz. p. 521, 10 *λέγεται καὶ κτητικὸν Πηλιωτικόν* refers to this fragment. Cf. Stat. *Achill.* 2. 410.—For *τρέφος*: *θρέμμα*, like *δέρος* (fr. 11): *δέρμα*, *βλέπος*: *βλέμμα*, see Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 1176.

155

γλώσσης μελίσσῃ τῷ κατερρυηκότι

155 *μελίσσῃ* Ellendt: *μελίσσης* codd.

155 Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 481 *ὕδατος, μελίσσης*] *ὕδατος καὶ μέλιτος· ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ ποιοῦντος τὸ ποιούμενον· καὶ ἐν Ἐρασταῖς 'γλώσσης...κατερρυηκότι.'*

Nauck says 'versus corrupti medelam desidero.' But for the silence or hesitation of previous editors, I should have thought that the remedy was obvious. Campbell, who half-heartedly suggests *γλῶσσαν* or *γλώσσῃ*, thinks that the text may be construed, 'with honey from his tongue.' But *γλώσσης* depends on the verb, and it is strange he should not have observed that *ῥεῖν* and its compounds require the dative (or less commonly the acc.) of the flowing liquid: Eur. *Tro.* 16 *φόνῳ καταρρεῖ*, *Bacch.* 142, Hom. X 149 etc. The corruption of *μελίσσῃ* to *μελίσσης* is hardly to be wondered at. The correction occurred to me independently, before I found that it had been made by Ellendt and Blaydes. Wecklein also (*Berlin. philol. Woch.* 1890 p. 656) proposed *γλῶσσαν μελίσσῃ*, comparing *Ai.* 9 *κάρα στάζων ἰδρῶτι.* Herwerden's remedy *γλώσσης μέλισσ' ὅση τις ἐρρύηκέ σοι*, afterwards improved to *μέλισσα σῆς κατερρύηχ' ὅση*, is unnecessarily violent. The same

remark applies to Gomperz's γλώσσης μέλισσα τανδρὸς ἐρρύη κάτα. The metaphor was familiar: cf. μελίγηρυς, μελίγλωσσος. In Homer of Nestor (Λ 248 Νηλῆς Πυλίων ἀγορητής, | τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή), who may be the person described here: Eur. fr. 899 εἴ μοι τὸ Νέστόρειον εὐγλώσσον μέλι (Barnes for μέλος) ...δοίη θεός. Poets are constantly compared to bees: see Jebb on Bacchyl. 9. 16. Theocr. 1. 146 πλῆρές τοι μέλιτος τὸ καλὸν στόμα, Θύρσι, γένοιτο. Sophocles himself was called the Attic bee (Suid. *s.v.*: cf. schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 460), and it was said of him Σοφοκλέους τοῦ μέλιτι τὸ στόμα κεχρισμένου (*vit.* § 13). Xenophon, whose speech was *melle dulcior* (Cic. *or.* 32), earned the same appellation (Suid. *s.v.*). For μέλισσα = μέλι see on fr. 1064 λίβανος.

156

ὁ δὲ ἔνθ' ὅπλοις ἀρρῶξιν Ἡφαίστου τέχνῃ

156 ἀρρῶξιν Bergk: ἀρῶξιν vel ἄρωξιν Choerob. | τέχνῃ Dindorf: τεχνίτου Choerob. σοφοῦ | θεῶν post Ἡφαίστου add. Mekler

156 Choerob. *in Theod.* p. 463, 29 (p. 415, 4 Hilgard) = Bekk. *anecd.* p. 1267 (cf. *anecd. Par.* 1 p. 396, 28) αἱ μέντοι μεταπεπλασμέναι δοτικαὶ πληθυντικαὶ προπαροξύνεσθαι θέλουσιν οἷον προβάτοις πρόβασιν...ὑπεσταλμένου τοῦ ἀρρῶξιν, ὥσπερ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς· 'ὁ δὲ ἔνθ'...τεχνίτου·' τοῦτο γὰρ κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρρήκτοις γενόμενον, τοῦ ἢ τραπέντος εἰς τὸ ῶ, προπερισπᾶται καὶ οὐ παροξύνεται. Part of the quotation is also found in Choerob. *in Theod.* p. 367, 32 (p. 339, 17 Hilgard) ἐπὶ τοῦ 'ἀρρῶξιν ὅπλοις' τὸ ἀρρῶξιν ἀρσενικὸν ὂν τῷ ὅπλοις τῷ οὐδετέρῳ συνετάγη.

ὁ δὲ ἔνθ' has been naturally suspected. Bergk conjectured ὁ δ' ἐν θ', and Lobeck (*Paralip.* p. 287) ἐνδύνθ'. The latter view, — an alternative would be ὁ δὲ | ἐνδὺς — is attractive, as applied to Achilles putting on the armour forged by Hephaestus; but ἐνδύναι is regularly followed by the acc., and Lobeck can produce no better parallel than Quint. 9. 68 δῦσαν ἐν ἔντεσι. Mekler suggests ὁλοένθ'.—**ἀρρῶξιν.** The adj., which occurs also in *Ant.* 251, is not well suited to the neut. ὅπλοις; but to speak of 'metaplasm' is beside the mark. See on Eur. *Hel.* 1301 δρομάδι κώλῳ, *Phoen.* 1024. Jebb on *Trach.* 930 ἀμφιπλῆγι φασγάνῳ.

τέχνῃ: abstract for concrete, of a work of art. So *O. C.* 472 κρατῆρές εἰσιν, ἀνδρὸς εὐχειρος τέχνη, and in Latin: Hor. *Carm.* 4. 8. 5 *divite me scilicet artium, quas aut Parrhasius protulit aut Scopas* and other exx. quoted in *Thesaurus* II 673, 9 ff. This use of τέχνη probably always prevailed in artistic circles, as it is common in later Greek.

157

ὀμμάτων ἄπο

λόγχας ἵησιν.

157 ὀμμάτων ἄπο | λόγχας Casaubon: ὀμματοπάλογχα cod. | ἵησιν Nauck: φησιν cod., ἀφίησιν vel ἀφιεῖς Dindorf

157 Hesych. III p. 203 καὶ ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς 'ὀμματοπάλογχα φησίν.' For the remainder of the gloss see on fr. 801. The shafts launched from the eyes which inflict the wound of love are fully illustrated on fr. 474. To the passages there quoted add Xen. *mem.* 1. 3. 13 ἴσως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐρῶντες τοξόται διὰ τοῦτο καλοῦνται, ὅτι καὶ πρόσωθεν οἱ καλοὶ τετρώσκουσιν. Plat. *symp.* 219 B (entirely misinterpreted by Stallbaum) ἀφεὶς ὥσπερ βέλη τετρῶσθαι αὐτὸν ᾤμην. Arsen. *prov.* 171 γυναικὸς ὄμμα τοῖς ἀκμάζουσιν βέλος. Aristaen. *ep.* 1 εὐστόχως ἐπιτοξεύειν ταῖς τῶν ὀμμάτων βολαῖς. Musaeus 95 ἀν' ὀφθαλμοῖο βολάων | κάλλει ἁλωθαίνει, καὶ ἐπὶ φρένας ἀνδρὸς ὀδεύει. Dindorf supports his conj. (see cr. n.) by the phrase ἡμέρον ἀφιεὶς applied to the ἐρώμενος in Poll. 3. 71. R. Ellis preferred ὀμμάτων πόθῳ | λ. ἵησιν, modified by Blaydes to πόθου | ἵησι λόγχας.

ΔΑΙΔΑΛΟΣ

The plot of the play is entirely unknown except in so far as a conjecture may be founded on the references to Talos[1]: see the nn. on frs. 160 and 161. I believe that fr. 162, which Nauck hesitates to attribute to Sophocles, was also an allusion to the brazen giant.

The only mythical incident connected with the name of Talos is that which relates to the home-coming of the Argonauts and is described in Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1638—1688: cf. Apollod. 1. 140 f. When Jason and his comrades desired to land in Crete, they were prevented by Talos, the brazen warder, who according to certain authorities had been given by Hephaestus to Minos, and whose duty it was to make a circuit of the island three times a day for the purpose of protecting it from strangers. Talos pelted the ship with rocks, and the Argo was obliged to sheer off. But Medea undertook to remove the obstacle, and, after invoking the destructive Keres, swift hounds of Death, to visit his eyes with destruction, made use of all her magical skill against the enemy. The result was that Talos struck his ankle against a pointed rock, and burst the *σῦριγξ* which contained his supply of vital energy—*ἐκ δέ οἱ ἰχὼρ | τηκομένῳ ἴκελος μολίβῳ ῥέεν* (1679 f.). Fr. 161 suggests that this narrative may have been the central incident of the Sophoclean play. Talos is rationalized in [Plat.] *Minos* 320 C.

The evidence that Daedalus was a representative title of Hephaestus is slight; but, though it is not universally admitted, there are insufficient grounds for contesting the identification: see C. Robert in Pauly-Wissowa IV 1995, Malten *ib.* VIII 360, and Bury on Pind. *Nem.* 4. 59. In Eur. *Her.* 471, where Kirchhoff, Dindorf, and Nauck retained *Δαιδάλου*, Wilamowitz accepted Hermann's *δαίδαλον*. If we assume that Daedalus-Hephaestus, as the artificer of Talos, was a prominent personage in the play, there is the more reason for admitting the suitability of a satyr-chorus in view of the cult-fellowship of Hephaestus with Dionysus, and of his association with the donkey and the phallus (Malten *u.s.* 356, Gruppe, pp. 245, 1306, 1311).

[1] Robert merely says that the *Daedalus* 'auf Kreta gespielt zu haben scheint' (Pauly-Wissowa IV 2006). Wagner suggested that the plot was similar to that of Euripides' *Cretans*.

158

ἴλλει μὲν εἶσω τόνδ' ἀχαλκεύτῳ πέδῃ

158 ἴλλει μὲν (εἰλλεῖ μὲν vel εἰλλῶμεν Diels) εἶσω van Leeuwen: ἐλλημενήσω cod., ἴλλοιμεν εἴσω Nauck, εἰλήσομέν σε Nicole | τόν δ' ἔα χαλκευτῷ cod., τῇδ' ἀχαλκεύτῳ Nicole

158 Schol. Gen. Hom. Φ 282 Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἀσκαλωνίτης ἐρχθέντα δασέως· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς ἔρσης. Κράτης εἰλθέντ' ἐν μεγάλῳ· ἴλλειν (ἰαλεῖν cod.) γὰρ φησὶν εἶναι τὸ εἴργειν, ὥστε τὴν τῆς κωλύσεως δίκην ἐξουλῆς καλεῖσθαι...ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Δαιδάλῳ 'ἐλλημενήσω τόν δ' ἔα χαλκευτῷ πέδῃ.'

ἴλλει. The question between the forms ἴλλω and εἰλλω, for εἰλῶ (εἰλλῶ) and the aspirated forms are to be rejected for reasons given by Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 89 f., is not easy to decide. There is no epigraphic evidence, and that of the MSS is worthless; for even the best vacillate, and Jebb's inference (*Ant.*, p. 251) in favour of ἴλλω is weakened by the fact that R does not support ἴλλε in Ar. *Nub.* 762. Cobet was emphatic in advocating ἴλλω, brushing aside all the instances of εἰλλω as mere blunders of the scribes: see *Misc. Crit.* p. 272, where he sums up his earlier discussions. Rutherford thought that the error τῖσαι (for τεῖσαι) favoured the genuineness of εἰλλω. But surely the converse error is equally well established. Kuehner-Blass (II 413) follow a good grammatical tradition in distinguishing ἴλλω *to wrap* from εἰλλω *to drive*: see Simplic. on Arist. *de caelo* 231^{b} 22 τὸ δὲ Ἰλλομένην εἴτε διὰ τοῦ ῑ γράφοιτο τὸ δεδεμένην δηλοῖ—εἴτε διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου γράφοιτο, καὶ οὕτως εἰργομένην δηλοῖ, ὡς καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Βασσάραις (fr. 25). Unfortunately, this does not help us here; for although the meaning is clear—'he confines him with fetters no smith has forged'—, we cannot tell whether the verb should be so written as to conform to the literal sense of πέδαις or not. I write ἴλλει, but without much confidence.—**ἀχαλκεύτῳ πέδῃ.** The same oxymoron (ἀχαλκεύτοις πέδαις) is applied by Aesch. *Cho.* 491 to the ἀμφίβληστρον in which Agamemnon was ensnared by Clytaemnestra, and by Eur. fr. 595 to the constraint imposed by αἰδώς.

R. Holland interpreted ἴλλειν of forcing an entrance into the island guarded by Talos. I should rather have guessed that the line referred to the labyrinth, which enclosed its prisoners with a new kind of compulsion.

159

τεκτόναρχος μοῦσα

159 Pollux 7. 117 ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς οἰκοδόμους τέκτονας Ὅμηρος (Z 315) καλεῖ, καὶ ἀρχιτέκτων εἴρηται παρὰ Πλάτωνι (*Lysid.* 259 E)· βιαία γὰρ ἡ ἐν τῷ Σοφοκλέους Δαιδάλῳ 'τεκτόναρχος μοῦσα.'

The context indicates that Pollux only criticized the formation adopted by Sophocles as forced, and βίαιος as a grammarians' word often means very little (Rutherford, *Annotation*, p. 319).—The muse is the chief of the builders of verse: Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 113 ἐκ ἑπτὰν κελαδεννῶν, | τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί | ἁρμόσαν, γιγνώσκομεν. *Nem.* 3. 4 μελιγαρυων τέκτονες κώμων ἀοιδαί (of the singers). Ar. *Eq.* 530 τέκτονες εὐπαλάμων ὕμνων. Ar. *Ran.* 1004 πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνά, referring to Aeschylus, implies magniloquence. Milton's (*Lycid.* 11) 'build the lofty rhyme' has familiarized the metaphor in English. In Latin *condere carmen* and the like were common: see *Thesaurus* IV 153. The view of R. Holland that Daedalus in these words was invoking the assistance of the goddess in the building of his flying-machine seems improbable. Nauck unnecessarily suggests τεκτονουργόν on the strength of Hesych. IV p. 138 τεκτονουργόν· ἀρχιτέκτων. Ellendt renders 'qui arti fabrili praest'; but the Muse could not be described as the patroness of carpenters.

160

[σαρδάνιος γέλως]

160 Schol. Plat. *rep.* 337 A *ἀνεκάγχασέ τε μάλα σαρδάνιον*]...Σιμωνίδης δὲ (fr. 202 A, *PLG* III 524) ἀπὸ Τάλω τοῦ χαλκοῦ, ὃν Ἥφαιστος ἐδημιούργησε Μίνῳ φύλακα τῆς νήσου ποιήσασθαι, <ὃν> ἔμψυχον ὄντα τοὺς πελάζοντάς φησι κατακαίοντα ἀναιρεῖν. ὅθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σεσηρέναι διὰ τὴν φλόγα τὸν σαρδάνιόν φησι λεχθῆναι γέλωτα. ὁμοίως καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Δαιδάλῳ.

It is a legitimate inference from this passage that Sophocles introduced Talos as preventing intruders from entering Crete by consuming them with fiery heat, and also that the phrase *σαρδάνιος γέλως* occurred in connexion with the grimaces of the scorched victims. Being constructed entirely of bronze he was able to make himself red-hot in the fire, so that he could destroy with his embrace anyone who came near him. For the isolated and obscure phrase *σαρδάνιος* (or *σαρδόνιος*) *γέλως*, which occurs first in Hom. *υ* 302 *μείδησε δὲ θυμῷ* | *σαρδάνιον μάλα τοῖον*, two derivations were current in antiquity. One of these referred it to the island of Sardinia, where a plant was said to grow so bitter that, when tasted, it caused convulsive spasms and involuntary laughter (cf. Pausan. 10. 17. 13, Tzetz. Lycophr. 796, Serv. Verg. *Ecl.* 7. 41 etc.): the other simply connected the adjective with *σεσηρέναι*. The first derivation, although it has influenced the spelling, is clearly fictitious; but the second may contain an element of truth (Adam on Plat. *l.c.*), although Monro considered that the phrase must be traced either to a proper name, or to some foreign—Egyptian or Phoenician—word, which had become proverbial. It is further to be noticed that the phrase is not always employed in the same sense; for it is applied not only to the sinister smile of vindictive triumph (Hom., Plat.), but also to the forced smile of the sufferer (cf. Cic. *Fam.* 7. 25. 1: the distinction made in Tyrrell's note cannot be maintained). It appears from the text that the latter was the sense in Simonides and Sophocles. But the other evidence affecting Simonides does not agree entirely with the schol. Plat. Thus Phot. *lex.* p. 500, 24 = Suid. *s.v. σαρδάνιος γέλως*.... Σιμωνίδης δὲ τὸν Τάλων τὸν ἡφαιστότευκτον Σαρδονίους οὐ βουλομένους περαιῶσαι πρὸς Μίνωα εἰς πῦρ καθαλλόμενον, ὡς ἂν χαλκοῦν, προστερνιζόμενον (l. προσστερνιζόμενον) ἀναιρεῖν ἐπιχάσκοντας. The words οὐ βουλομένους and the introduction of Σαρδονίους are unintelligible. Bernhardy (on Suid.), who records other conjectures, suggests the omission of οὐ: I would rather omit Σαρδονίους altogether as the blundering addition of someone who wanted to bring in Sardinia at all hazards, as if ἐπιχάσκοντας were not enough, and read τοὺς βουλομένους for οὐ βουλομένους. The result would tally with the text, but it is impossible to regard the account of Zenob. 5. 85 as anything but a deliberate attempt to conflate the two etymologies: Σιμωνίδης δὲ φησὶ τὸν Τάλω πρὸ τῆς εἰς Κρήτην ἀφίξεως οἰκῆσαι τὴν Σαρδὼ καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ διαφθεῖραι, οὓς τελευτῶντας σεσηρέναι, καὶ ἐκ τούτου ὁ Σαρδόνιος γέλως. The matter is of some importance not only because Bergk rests the version of Simonides upon the statements of Phot.-Suid. and Zenob., and neglects altogether the more trustworthy evidence of the schol. Plat., but also as affecting our estimate of the credit due to these authorities,—and more particularly to the source of Zenobius. Although Sophocles is mentioned only by the schol. Plat., the natural inference is that his account of Talos was similar to that of Simonides. It should be added that Apollod. 1. 140 says of Talos, who is introduced in the course of the story of the Argonauts: οἳ δὲ ὑπὸ Ἡφαίστου Μίνωι δοθῆναι, ὃς ἦν χαλκοῦς ἀνήρ.

It is worth while to notice that the explanations already quoted by no means exhaust the ingenuity devoted to the elucidation of *σαρδάνιος γέλως*. Thus the schol. on *υ* 302 also explains it by reference to Talos, whom he describes as the watchman made by Hephaestus and given by Zeus to Europa to punish anyone landing in Crete. *πηδῶντα γὰρ εἰς πῦρ καὶ θερμαίνοντα τὸ στῆθος περιπτύσσεσθαι αὐτούς· ὧν καιομένων, ἐκεῖνον σεσηρέναι.* As in the text of Homer, the laughter is that of the avenger. Sardinia was brought in by Timaeus (*FHG* I 199), who tells a strange story of the old men

being buried alive and laughing at their prospective happiness; and by Demon (*FHG* 1 380), who speaks of the most handsome captives and the old men over 70 being sacrificed to Cronos, and laughing at their own courage. Another fragment of Timaeus (schol. Lycophr. 796, *FHG* 1 199), describing the sacrifice of the old men, makes their sacrificers laugh, while they beat them with clubs and thrust them over the precipice. [For the reference of this story to 'Aeschylus' περὶ παροιμιῶν in Zenob. 5. 85 see Crusius, *Anal. crit. paroem.* p. 148.] Clitarchus preferred the derivation from σεσηρέναι, explaining that it was the custom of the Carthaginians, when sacrificing their children to Cronos, to place them in the arms of a brazen idol, with a heated oven burning beneath (schol. Plat., Phot. etc.).

There is a special treatise by L. Merckelin, entitled *Die Talossage u. das sardonische Lachen*, Petersb. 1851, which I have not been able to see. For the assumed identity of Hephaestus and Daedalus see Introductory Note.

161

[Τάλῳ εἵμαρτο τελευτῆσαι]

161 Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1638 ὁ Τάλως ἐπὶ τοῦ σφυροῦ σύριγγα εἶχεν ὑμένι περιεχομένην. σῦριγξ δὲ λέγεται ἡ περόνη. ὅτι δὲ εἵμαρτο αὐτῷ τελευτῆσαι λέγει Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Τάλῳ. τὸν δὲ Τάλων τὸν φύλακα τοῦ Μίνω τρὶς μὲν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πᾶσαν περιπολεῖν τὴν Κρήτην τηλικαύτην οὖσαν, τὴν δὲ ζωὴν μόνον τῶν ἐμψύχων τοῦτον ἐν τῷ σφυρῷ κεκτῆσθαι.

The scholia were edited from the Laurentianus by H. Keil in the second volume of Merkel's Apollonius (1854). They are stated in the *subscriptio* to be derived from Lucillus Tarrhaeus, Sophocles, and Theon: for the course of tradition see Wilamowitz, *Einleitung*, p. 186. The text as given in Wellauer's edition from the codd. Flor. and Paris. often shews differences of language, but not much important divergence. Dindorf quotes the above extract from Brunck. For ἐν Τάλῳ Brunck substituted ἐν Δαιδάλῳ, but this is probably one of the cases where the name of a leading character was substituted for the title of the play: see fr. 125.

It has been suggested in the Introductory Note that the story of the death of Talos as told in the *Argonautica* may have been a leading incident in the play. Apollod. 1 140 describes the σῦριγξ thus: εἶχε δὲ φλέβα μίαν ἀπὸ αὐχένος κατατείνουσαν ἄχρι σφυρῶν, κατὰ δὲ τὸ δέρμα τῆς φλεβὸς ἦλος διήρειστο χαλκοῦς. He gives three different versions of the death of Talos, none of which agrees with that of Apollonius: (1) he became mad through the magic potions of Medea; (2) Medea promised to make him immortal and drew out the nail, so that all his vital fluid (ἰχώρ) escaped; (3) Poeas wounded him in the ankle with an arrow.

162

ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ κάνθαρος
τῶν Αἰτναίων <γε> πάντως

162. 1 οὐδὲ V: οὐ cett. 2 γε addidi

162 Schol. Ar. *Pac.* 73 μέγαλοι λέγονται εἶναι κατὰ τὴν Αἴτνην κάνθαροι, μαρτυροῦσιν δὲ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι... Σοφοκλῆς Δαιδάλῳ 'ἀλλ' πάντως,' λέγει δὲ πάντως εἰκάζων εἰς μέγαν.

The sense may be rendered: 'well, it certainly isn't a beetle,—not one from Aetna anyhow.' R. Holland thinks that the remark was made by Talos of Daedalus as he flew away; I should rather suppose that it was a comment on the appearance of Talos himself.—Jebb on *O. C.* 312 Αἰτναίαις ἐπὶ | πώλοις βαβῶσαν thinks that the Αἰτναῖοι μέγιστοι κάνθαροι of Ar. *Pac.* 73 was not a mere joke on the Aetnaean breed of horses, but an allusion to a species of beetle actually found there. The evidence seems to me to point in the opposite direction, and also to indicate that the joke in the time

of Aristophanes was a somewhat musty one. If not, it is odd that the four illustrations quoted by the scholiast are all of a *comic* character; that, if everyone knew that there really was an Aetnaean beetle, Plato the comic poet should have thought it worth while to say that it was reported to be bigger than a man (fr. 37, I 610 K.); and also that the Sicilian Epicharmus (fr. 76 ὁ Πυγμαρίων λοχαγὸς ἐκ τῶν κανθάρων | τῶν μεζόνων οὓς φαντι τὰν Αἴτναν ἔχειν) should mention a *report* that there were big beetles on Aetna. The remaining passage is Aesch. fr. 233 Αἰτναῖός ἐστι κάνθαρος βίᾳ πόνων (or πονῶν), from the satyric Σίσυφος πετροκυλιστής. In any case, there is nothing to justify Nauck in questioning the authenticity of the fragment. On the other hand, I see no reason to disbelieve the repeated statement (Hesych. I p. 88 etc.) that the Aetnaean horses were a big, as well as a good breed: see also on fr. 672. The starting-point of comparison was probably κάνθων: Greg. Cypr. 2. 24 Αἰτναῖον κάνθωνα· τὸν μέγαν.—ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δή rejects an alternative, as in *El.* 913, *Ai.* 877, *Trach.* 1128 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ τοῖς γ' ἐφ' ἡμέραν ἐρεῖς. I have added γε partly for obvious metrical reasons, and partly because it gives to Αἰτναίων exactly that slight stress which seems to be required: see *Trach. l.c.*, Ar. *Nub.* 126 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐγὼ μέντοι πεσών γε κείσομαι, Plat. *Symp.* 197 A καὶ μὲν δὴ τήν γε τῶν ζῴων ποίησιν.—The penultimate syllable of Αἰτναίων was probably shortened: cf. fr. 956 n.—πάντως more often precedes the negative,—'certainly not' rather than 'not anyhow': but cf. Ar. *Pac.* 1147 οὐ γὰρ οἶόν τ' ἐστὶ πάντως οἰναρίζειν τήμερον. Herwerden deleted the word, thinking that its proper place is only with λέγει (*dicit omnino*). Dindorf conjectured ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν δὴ κάνθαρος οὗτος, coll. *El.* 103.

163

γοργάδων

163 Hesych. I p. 442 γοργάδων· ἀλιάδων. Δαιδάλῳ Σοφοκλῆς. *ibid.* γοργίδες· αἱ ὠκεανίδες. Zonar. p. 448 γοργάδες· αἱ δέσποιναι.

The adj. γοργός appears originally to have meant 'flashing' (Eur. *Phoen.* 146 n.), but the transition to 'fierce, terrible (to look at)' is easy: cf. Γοργώ, γοργῶπις. Some modern scholars have used this evidence in support of their theory that the Gorgons were originally sea-nymphs (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1864) who dwelt on the shore of the western sea (Roscher, *Lex.* II 1694); but it is sufficient to say that the epithet is naturally applied to the miraculous beings of sailor's stories. Gruppe (p. 12098) suggests a comparison with the Haliae, who fought with Dionysus against Perseus (Pausan. 2. 22. 1). In Lycophr. 1349 ἡ παλίμφορων Γοργάς is supposed to be Hera. It should be added that Gorgo is often mated with Poseidon.

164

ἐσέφθην

164 Hesych. II p. 201 ἐσέφθην· ἐσεβάσθην, ἡσύχασα, ᾐσχύνθην. Σοφοκλῆς Δαιδάλῳ (Palmer for παιδάλῳ). Phot. *lex.* p. 19. 7 ἐσέφθην· τὸ ἐσεβάσθην. Σοφοκλῆς. Choerob. *in Theod.* p. 489, 21 (p. 20, 23 Hilgard) σημειούμεθα παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι (*Phaedr.* 254 B) τὸ ἐσέφθην καὶ τὸ σεφθεῖσα. ἐσέβδην is erroneously adduced from Sophocles in Cramer, *anecd. Oxon.* IV p. 338, 17.

This is the aor. of the deponent σέβομαι, and so is σεφθεῖσα, which is used absolutely in Plat. *Phaedr.* = *in adoration* (cf. Porph. *vit. Plot.* 12). A similarly isolated form ἐσεβίσθην occurs in *O.C.* 636 ἀγὼ σεβισθείς. The later ἐσεβάσθην, recognized above by the grammarians, is attested by *A. P.* 7. 122 Πυθαγόρης τί τόσον κυάμους ἐσεβάσθη; The use of the so-called 'passive' form with an active meaning is actually a survival from the time when this aorist form was associated with the active voice: see Brugmann, *Gr. Gramm.* § 150. For other illustrations see on fr. 837, 2 δερχθέντες.

ΔΑΝΑΗ

On the question raised by this title and its relation to the *Acrisius* see the Introductory Note to that play (p. 38). Of the fragments attributed to the *Danae* fr. 165 alone is significant, and that, while agreeing well enough with Jacobs's assumption, seems to be decisive against a solution which otherwise might have deserved consideration, that the *Danae* was parallel in construction to the *Dictys* of Euripides, and was concerned with the events in Seriphos. For Wagner, who adopted the last-named hypothesis, failed to show that the words of fr. 165 have any appropriateness in the mouth of Polydectes, to whom he would assign them.

165

οὐκ οἶδα τὴν σὴν πεῖραν· ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι,
τοῦ παιδὸς ὄντος τοῦδ' ἐγὼ διόλλυμαι.

165 Schol. Soph. *Ai.* 1 πεῖρα γὰρ ἡ βλάβη, ὡς καὶ ἐν Δανάῃ 'οὐκ...διόλλυμαι.' The same words occur in Suid. *s.v.* πεῖρα, who has οὐδ' in place of ἓν δ'.

The extract may be taken to come from a scene between Acrisius and Danae, after the discovery of the birth of Perseus, in which Danae had pleaded that she had been the victim of forcible usage. Acrisius would then reply: 'I know nothing of the attempt you tell me of, but only that, if this child lives, I am undone.' In Ar. *Av.* 583 τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκκοψάντων ἐπὶ πεῖρα the schol. gives the same explanation ἐπὶ βλάβῃ. The verb πειρᾶν is used c. acc. of forcible attempts upon women: Ar. *Eq.* 517. Phot. *lex.* p. 405, 19 πειρᾶν· τὸ πειράζειν ἐπὶ φθορᾷ καὶ συνουσίᾳ· Μένανδρος. Moeris p. 207, 2 πειρᾶν τὴν παῖδα Ἀττικοί, πειράζειν διαφθείρων Ἕλληνες. So the noun in *A.P.* 12. 251 πρόσθε μὲν ἀντιπρόσωπα φιλήματα καὶ τὰ πρὸ πείρας | εἴχομεν. For τὴν σήν cf. *El.* 1110 οὐκ οἶδα τὴν σὴν κλῆδον'· ἀλλά μοι γέρων | ἐφεῖτ' κτέ., *Ai.* 791 οὐκ οἶδα τὴν σὴν πρᾶξιν, Αἴαντος δ' ὅτι...οὐ θαρσῶ πέρι. So Eur. *Heracl.* 284 τὸ σὸν γὰρ Ἄργος οὐ δέδοικ' ἐγώ (n.), *Rhes.* 866 οὐκ οἶδα τοὺς σοὺς οὐδ λέγεις Ὀδυσσέας | ἡμεῖς δ' ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐδενὸς πεπλήγμεθα, Aesch. fr. 14 κἄγωγε τὰς σὰς βαικάρεις τε καὶ μύρα. Meineke (*Anal. Soph.* p. 274) conjectured τῆς παιδὸς ὄντως τῆσδ', supposing that Zeus was speaking of his passion for Danae.

166

γόνοισι μήλων κἀφροδισίαν ἄγραν

166 γόνοισι scripsi: γόνοιον codd., γόνον τε Musurus, γονῆν τε coni. Nauck

166 Hesych. 1 p. 339 ἀφροδισία ἄγρα· Σοφοκλῆς Δανάῃ 'γόνοιον ...ἄγραν.' οἱ μὲν τοὺς περδικας, οἱ δὲ (δὲ codd.: corr. Musurus) πρὸς τὸν καθαρμὸν ἁρμόζουσιν, τῇ δὲ θηλείᾳ παλεύοντες αἱροῦσιν αὐτούς. κακῶς δέ· χοίρῳ γὰρ καθαίρουσι καὶ ἀρνίῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ περδικι. Λέγει οὖν τὴν τῶν συῶν διὰ τὸ καταφερὲς εἶναι τὸ ζῷον πρὸς συνουσίαν. καπρᾶν γε τοι καὶ κάπραιναν ἀπὸ τούτου (*i.e.* they are derived from καταφερής: see Hesych. 11 p. 401). δύναται δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν αἰγῶν γονὴν δηλοῦν. καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ζῷον λίαν ἐπτόηται πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια· ὥστε καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸ ἁβρύνειν. The phrase ἀφροδισία ἄγρα is referred to elsewhere, but without any light being thrown

on the obscurities of Hesych.: Bekk. *anecd.* p. 472, 22 *ἀφροδισία ἄγρα· οἱ πέρδικες, διὰ τὸ τοὺς θηρῶντας τῇ θηλείᾳ ἐπιβουλεύοντας αἱρεῖν αὐτούς.* Eustath. *Il.* p. 1183, 19 *λέγεται δέ, φασί, καὶ ἀφροδισία ἄγρα καθὰ πέρδιξ, οὕτω καὶ σῦς· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὁ χοῖρος κατωφερὴς εἰς ἀφροδίσια.* Macar. 2. 70 *ἀφροδισία ἄγρα· ἐπὶ τῶν ἔρωτι ἁλισκομένων.*

The proper inference to be drawn from the difficult text of Hesychius is that Sophocles used the phrase *ἀφροδισία ἄγρα* without clearly specifying in the context to what class of animal it applied. Some commentators held that partridges, 'which of course (*δή* appears to be used ironically) are suitable for purification,' must be meant, because their uxoriousness is made a snare to entrap them. But Diogenianus, if he was Hesychius' original, argued that the partridge must be excluded, because, though a pig or a sheep might be sacrificed for the purpose of *καθαρμός*, a partridge could not. He concludes that the pig (or possibly the goat) is the animal intended. It is surely implied in this statement that the context in Sophocles was concerned with a sacrifice of purification, although the words relating to it are not quoted. The sexual propensities of the partridge are mentioned in Arist. *hist. an.* 1. 1. 13, 9. 9. 2; and in Ael. *nat. an.* 3. 5, 16; 4. 1; 7. 19. Cf. Plin. *n. h.* 10. 33. 100—102. The pig was the victim most commonly selected in purificatory rites: cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 283 *καθαρμοῖς ἡλάθη* (*scil.* *μίασμα*) *χοιροκτόνοις, ibid.* 453, and see Stengel, *Kultusaltertümer*[2], p. 145. At Tanagra Hermes freed the town from a plague by carrying a ram round the walls on his shoulder (Pausan. 9. 22. 1).

γόνοισι. I prefer this to *γόνον τε* (see cr. n.) as more likely to have been corrupted to *γόνοιον*, especially with *μήλων* following. I cannot follow M. Schmidt's argument that the words *γόνοιον μήλων* ought to be rejected altogether; and his transposition of the words *οἳ δὲ...ἁρμόζουσι* so as to follow *αἱροῦσιν αὐτούς* does not yield a satisfactory sense. R. Ellis conjectured *γονεῖα*.

167

ζῇ, πῖνε, φέρβου

167 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 97, 32 *ζῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῇθι...Σοφοκλῆς Δανάῃ 'ζῇ, πῖνε, φέρβου.'*

No doubt the sentiment was 'Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.' It was a commonplace of proverbial philosophy. Theogn. 1047 *νῦν μὲν πίνοντες τερπώμεθα, καλὰ λέγοντες· | ἄσσα δ' ἔπειτ' ἔσται, ταῦτα θεοῖσι μέλει.* Eur. *Alc.* 788 *εὔφραινε σαυτόν, πῖνε, τὸν καθ' ἡμέραν | βίον λογίζου σόν, τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῆς τύχης.* fr. 196. Athen. 530 B, from the epitaph of Sardanapallus: *ἔσθιε, πῖνε, παῖζε· ὡς τἄλλα τούτου οὐκ ἄξια.* Hor. *Carm.* 1. 9. 13. Sen. *controv.* 2. 6. 3 *convivae certe tui dicunt: bibamus, moriendum est.* So often in the Anthology: see *A.P.* 11. 56, 57, 62.—For the imperative *ζῇ* see Jebb on *Ant.* 1169 *καὶ ζῇ τύραννον σχῆμ' ἔχων*, and cf. Eur. fr. 826 *δὶ' ἐλπίδος ζῇ.* Cobet points out (*N.L.* p. 524) that *ζῇθι* is a late barbarism due to the false analogy of *στῆθι*.

168

αὐθημερόν

168 Hesych. 1 p. 203 *ἀνθήμερον· <τῇ> σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ. Σοφοκλῆς Δανάῃ.* Brunck restored *αὐθημερόν* (*αὐθήμερον* Schrevel). The error is an early one, as it is implied in the alphabetical order. *αὐθημερόν* occurs also in Aesch. *Pers.* 459.

169

βράχιστον

169 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 85, 18 βραχιστον· βραχύτατον. Σοφοκλῆς Δανάῃ. Hesych. 1 p. 396 βράχιστον· ἐλάχιστον.

βράχιστος is used by Sophocles also in *Ant.* 1327, and the adv. βράχιστα in *O.C.* 1115. Pind. *Isthm.* 5. 59 has ἐν βραχίστοις, and Eur. *Suppl.* 478 ἐκ βραχιστων. The usual prose form is, of course, βραχύτατος.

170

δεδαιμονισμένον

170 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 90, 31 δαιμονίζεσθαι. Σοφοκλῆς Δανάῃ δεδαιμονισμένον ἀντὶ τοῦ τεθεωμένον.

δαιμονίζεσθαι is elsewhere *to be possessed*: cf. Plut. *qu. conv.* 7. 5. 4 p. 706 D ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν. Nor is its meaning essentially different in Philemon fr. 191 (II 530 K.) ἄλλος κατ' ἄλλην δαιμονίζεται τύχην, which must be read in connexion with the conception of δαίμων συγγενής or τύχη συγγενὴς τῷ σώματι (id. fr. 10, II 481 K.). It is impossible to say how Sophocles employed the participle, but the explanation *deified* is probably misleading, if it is intended to apply to such a case as the translation of Heracles. Blaydes conjectured that τεθειωμένον ('dedicated') should be restored for τεθεωμένον.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΣΚΟΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΙΚΟΣ

From the title and the three extant fragments it is clear that the *Dionysiscus* represented the god as an infant in his cradle, even then providing for his worshippers the miraculous gift of wine. It was a satyr-play; and the scene was perhaps laid in the fairy-land of Nysa, the home of the nymphs who were the nurses of the god, on the shore of the Ocean stream: see note on fr. 959.

In view of the recent data, which were unknown to Welcker, it is no longer necessary to recall his guesses concerning the story of the play. The infancy of Dionysus as the nursling of the nymphs is described in Hom. *h.* 26. The subject was often celebrated in works of art: see Gruppe, p. 1435$_1$. In Ap. Rhod. 4. 1131 ff. Macris, the daughter of Aristaeus, received the child from Hermes at her home in Euboea and gave him honey to eat. Silenus, who was probably the speaker in fr. 171, appears as the guardian of the young god also in Pind. fr. 156 ὁ ζαμενὴς δ' ὁ χοροιτύπος, | ὃν Μαλεάγονος ἔθρεψε Ναΐδος αἰκοίτας | Σιληνός (see however Schroeder's text). Diod. 4. 4 describes him as

παιδαγωγός and τροφεύς of Dionysus. The title, now correctly restored for Διονυσιακός, is parallel to the Ἡρακλίσκος of Theocr. 24: see Crusius in *Rh. Mus.* XLVIII 153.

171

ὅταν γὰρ αὐτῷ προσφέρω βρῶσιν διδούς,
τὴν ῥῖνά μ' εὐθὺς ψηλαφᾷ, κἄνω φέρει
τὴν χεῖρα πρὸς <τὸ> φαλακρὸν ἡδὺ διαγελῶν.

171. **2** τὴν ῥῖναν εὐθὺς ψιλαφᾷ cod. **3** τὸ add. Blaydes

171 *Lex. Messan.* f. 283 r. ψηλαφᾷ (ψιλαφᾷ cod.) σὺν τῷ ῑ Σοφοκλῆς Διονυσίσκῳ 'ὅταν...διαγελῶν.'

Silenus is probably the speaker: see Introductory Note.

1 προσφέρω, of offering food, as in fr. 502.

2 τὴν ῥῖνά μ': for the double accusative see *Phil.* 1301 μέθες με, πρὸς θεῶν, χεῖρα (with Jebb's n.).

3 Blaydes's addition of the article is no doubt correct, for usage indicates that the neuter is used substantivally. H., who made the same correction independently, quoted Herond. 6. 76 τὸ φαλακρὸν καταψῶσα and Athen. 507 c δοκεῖν γὰρ ἔφη τὸν Πλάτωνα κορώνην γενόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀναπηδήσαντα τὸ φαλακρὸν κατασκαριφᾶν. Add fr. 314, 359 παύου τὸ λεῖον φαλακρὸν ἡδονῇ πιτνάς. It would hardly be satisfactory to take πρὸς φαλακρόν as acc. sing. masc. with διαγελῶν, although πρὸς often follows verbs expressing emotion (*Trach.* 1211, Kaibel on *El.* p. 198). For the ridicule attaching to baldness cf. Ar. *Nub.* 540 and the passages collected by Jacobs *Anth.* IX p. 423, and Mayor on Juv. 4. 38, 5. 171. Blaydes's further conjecture ἡδέως γελῶν is altogether needless.

172

πόθεν ποτ' ἄλυπον ὧδ'
ηὗρον ἄνθος ἀνίας;

172. **1** sq. ὧδε εὗρον vulgo

172 Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 82, 18= Bekk. *anecd.* p. 385, 23 ἄλυπον ἄνθος ἀνίας· εἰ θέλοις εἰπεῖν ἐπί (Nauck conj. περί unnecessarily) τινος πράγματος ὃ λύπης ἀπαλλάττει, οὕτως ἂν χρήσαιο ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τῷ Διονυσιακῷ σατυρικῷ (τῷ σατυρικῷ Phot.) ἐπὶ οἴνου πρῶτον γευσαμένων τῶν κατὰ τὸν χορὸν σατύρων· 'πόθεν...ἀνίας'; ὅλον δὲ τὸ μελύδριον πολιτικὸν ἄγαν γέγονε. μετὰ γὰρ τῆς ἄλλης ἐναργείας λελυμένην ἔχει τὴν ἑρμηνείαν καὶ μεθύουσιν ἁρμόττουσαν. δεῖ δὲ τὰς λύσεις τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἁρμόττειν τοῖς νοήμασι καὶ μὴ σφίγγειν, καὶ μηδαμοῦ σύνδεσμον παρατιθέναι, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον τὴν λύσιν φυλάττειν. According to Reitzenstein, the extract is ultimately derived from Phrynichus (fr. 162 de B.).

Campbell joins ἄλυπον ἀνίας, leaving ἄνθος isolated and in defiance of the order of the words. He accounts for the latter by strangely interpreting the grammarian as imputing to the poet 'an inebriate looseness of expression,' whereas he actually says that 'the style is abrupt, though clear': see *e.g.* Demetr. *de eloc.* 193 διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Μένανδρον ὑποκρίνονται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις. The purpose of the note is mainly to illustrate the transferred sense of ἄλυπος, which a few lines above had been glossed by ὁ μὴ λυπούμενος. The words of Soph. are not easy, and Nauck thinks ἄνθος corrupt, proposing ἄκος, but the resulting sense is weak. Tucker conjectured ἄλθος (= φάρμακον), which is approved by

Mekler, and Weil *ἀνίας*. I would render 'this sorrow-healing crown of pain,' with an oxymoron like *ἐφίμερον κακόν* (fr. 149) or Juliet's 'Parting in such sweet sorrow': *ἄνθος ἀνίας* is thus exactly parallel to *μανίας ἄνθος* in *Trach.* 999. (Valckenaer and Blaydes introduce *μανίας* here for *ἀνίας*.) One may suppose that the satyrs did not appreciate the flavour of the wine, at least until they perceived its effect. But, even apart from this, the potency of the wine-cup may be described as wounding: Pind. fr. 218 *δέξονται φρένας ἀμπελίνοις τόξοις δαμέντες*. Or it affords a mixture of joy and sorrow: Alcae fr. 47 *ἄλλοτα μὲν μελιάδεος, ἄλλοτα δ'* | *ὀξυτέρω τριβόλων ἀρυτήμενοι*. We have in fact exactly the same oxymoron as here in Hor. *Carm.* 3. 21 *tu lene tormentum ingenio admoves* | *plerumque duro*, which is adapted from Bacchyl. fr. 16 J. *γλυκεῖ' ἀνάγκα σενομενᾶν κυλίκων θάλπηρόν θυμόν*. For the commonplace to which Διόνυσον points see on fr. 758. There is not necessarily any reference to the result of *excessive* wine-drinking, as in Panyassis fr. 14 K. *πάσας δ' ἐκ κραδίας ἀνίας ἀνδρῶν ἀλαπάζει* | *πινόμενος κατὰ μέτρον· ὑπὲρ μέτρον δὲ χερείων*, and often in the comic poets: see the passages collected in Athen. 36 A foll. The metre is an acephalous Glyconic (Telesilleum) followed by a Pherecratean:

$$\text{A} \smile\ \smile\ \smile\

Phoenix are alternative titles; that the subject of the play was the fetching from Scyros by Phoenix of the young Neoptolemus, against the wishes of Lycomedes and Deidamia; and that the first *εἰκών* of the younger Philostratus follows the Sophoclean tradition. R. Wagner (*Epit. Vat.* p. 224) agreed with Welcker, without giving any fresh reasons. Inasmuch, however, as there is now good cause to believe that the mission of Odysseus and Phoenix to Scyros was the subject of the *Scyrians*, Welcker's guess concerning the character of the plot of the *Dolopes* has no longer any probability. The Dolopians have no place in heroic legends, except as explained above, and only two possibilities seem to be open. Either *Dolopes* was, as Welcker thought, a secondary title to the *Phoenix*, but with a plot relating to the earlier adventures of that hero[1]; or, if an independent play, it may have been concerned with the concealment of Achilles in the palace of Lycomedes, and his discovery by the Greek envoys. Fr. 174 is too insecure a prop to support the latter alternative.

174

εὐναῖος εἴη δραπέτιν στέγην ἔχων

174 Phot. *lex.* p. 36, 12 *εὐναῖος· ἐγκεκρυμμένος. Σοφοκλῆς Δόλοψιν 'εὐναῖος... ἔχων.'* So also *Etym. M.* p. 393, 44, where D alone has *δραπέτιν*, the others *δραπέτην*. Cf. Hesych. II p. 227 *εὐναῖος· λαγώς. Σοφοκλῆς Δόλοψι. καπτηχής* (*κατεπτηχώς* Nauck), I p. 507 *δρομαῖος λαγώδος· ὁ ἐν δρόμοις ἁλισκόμενος· εὐναῖος δὲ ὁ ἐν κοίτῃ.*

εὐναῖος was applied to the hare in her form)(*δρομαῖος*, with which cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 123. So *πτῶκα λαγώ* in Hom. X 310 etc. Valckenaer conjectured that *λαγώς* immediately preceded *εὐναῖος*. Naber proposed *εἴην* for *εἴη*, but the context may just as well have required the third person.—**δραπέτιν στέγην**, 'a run-away home,' is one from which the occupant is continually shifting. For the transference of the epithet cf. *Phil.* 208 *αὐδὰ τρυσάνωρ*, *ib.* 695, *O. C.* 1463 *κτύπος διόβολος*, *Ai.* 611 *χερὸπλακτοι δοῦποι*, *ib.* 55 *πολύκερων φόνον*, Eur. *Phoen.* 660, 1350 (nn.). *A. P.* 10. 87 *ἂν μὴ γελῶμεν τὸν βίον τὸν δραπέτην* is not parallel, since there life is supposed itself to be changing.

Ahrens suggested that the fragment described the outcast condition of Phoenix when an exile.

175

χαμεύνη

175 Cyrill. *lex.* ap. Schow. in Hesych. p. 781 *χαμευνά· ἡ ἐπὶ γῆς κατάκλισις. καὶ τὸ ταπεινὸν κλινίδιον χαμεύνη. Σοφοκλῆς Δόλοψι.* Bachm. *anecd.* I p. 412, 28 *χαμεύνα· ταπεινὴ καὶ εὐτελὴς κλίνη, <ἡ> καὶ στιβάς.* The word had already been used by Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1541) in the figurative sense.

[1] See Introductory Note to the *Phoenix*.

ΕΛΕΝΗΣ ΑΠΑΙΤΗΣΙΣ

The subject of this play is indicated by the title[1], and was derived from the narrative of the *Cypria*, as appears from the epitome of Proclus (*EGF* p. 19): *καὶ διαπρεσβεύονται πρὸς τοὺς Τρῶας τὴν Ἑλένην καὶ τὰ κτήματα ἀπαιτοῦντες· ὡς δὲ οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν ἐκεῖνοι, ἐνταῦθα δὴ τειχομαχοῦσιν.* According to Proclus, the embassy was subsequent to the landing on the coast of the Troad, and to the deaths of Protesilaus and Cycnus; but Apollodorus (*epit.* 3. 28) and the scholiast on the *Iliad* presently to be quoted make it precede the departure from Tenedos. R. Wagner (*Epit. Vat.* p. 197) conjectured that the latter was an innovation upon the version of the *Cypria* made by Sophocles himself. The embassy of Odysseus and Menelaus has already been mentioned in the Introductory Note to the *Antenoridae* (p. 87). They were entertained by Antenor on that occasion, as he himself explained to Helen (Hom. Γ 205 ff.): *ἤδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ' ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, | σεῦ ἕνεκ' ἀγγελίης, σὺν ἀρηιφίλῳ Μενελάῳ· | τοὺς δ' ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα.* In spite of the support of Antenor, the mission was a failure. Paris actually bribed Antimachus to recommend that the envoys should be put to death; but from this danger Antenor succeeded in rescuing them (Λ 139 ff.): *ὅς (sc.* Ἀντίμαχος) *ποτ' ἐνὶ Τρώων ἀγορῇ Μενέλαον ἄνωγεν, | ἀγγελίην ἐλθόντα σὺν ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆι, | αὖθι κατακτεῖναι μηδ' ἐξέμεν ἆψ ἐς Ἀχαιούς.* The occasion is identified by schol. A on Hom. Γ 206: *πρὸ τοῦ στρατεῦσαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας εἰς Τροίαν ἦλθον πρέσβεις Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Μενέλαος ἀπαιτοῦντες Ἑλένην, ἐν οἷς* (ᾧ conj. Nauck) *τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοὺς μεθ' ὕβρεως διωξάντων μόνος Ἀντήνωρ ξενίζει φιλοφρόνως. ὅτε γὰρ ἐκ Τενέδου ἐπρεσβεύοντο οἱ περὶ Μενέλαον, τότε Ἀντήνωρ ὁ Ἱκεταονος ὑπεδέξατο αὐτοὺς καὶ δολοφονεῖσθαι μέλλοντας ἔσωσεν.* The scholiast's words need not be taken to refer to a secret assassination; they may simply point to the treachery of slaying an envoy. Such also appears to be the intention of Ovid's *at Paris et fratres et qui rapuere sub illo | vix tenuere manus...nefandas* (*Met.* 13. 202 f.). According to Johannes Tzetzes (*Antehom.* 154 ff.), who includes Palamedes, Acamas, and Diomedes in the number of the envoys, these events occurred before the gathering at Aulis. In the rationalized account which Herodotus received from the Egyptian priests, when Menelaus and his colleagues arrived at Troy on their

[1] A play with the same title was written by Timesitheus, who is only known from his notice in Suid. *s.v.*

mission, they received the answer that Helen was not there (2. 118). For the poem of Bacchylides see p. 89.

Engelmann (*Archäol. Stud.*, Berlin 1900, p. 16) found a representation of certain characters in this play on a vase belonging to the Vatican Museum (Arm. 294), and identified them as Helen and two of her attendants listening to an interview between Odysseus and Antenor, which took place at a temple close to the sea-shore. He concluded from fr. 177 that the embassy arrived after Helen had reached Troy, and referred fr. 176 to Helen or one of her women overhearing the Laconian speech of Menelaus; Welcker[1] had previously inferred from frs. 176 and 178 that a meeting took place between Helen and Menelaus; and that Helen, when her surrender was refused, being now desirous of returning to Greece, contemplated suicide as her last resource.

The connexion between fr. 180 and the events outlined above is not at all obvious; and it does not seem possible that the strife between Calchas and Mopsus, and the former's death after his defeat, were narrated in the play as having already occurred. We must rather infer from Strabo's statements that the prediction of his death was either mentioned by Calchas himself, or used against him to counteract the effect of his own prophecies[2].

The tradition ran that, after the capture of Troy, Calchas, who had accurate foreknowledge of the disaster impending for the Greek fleet, refused to return home, and, accompanied by Amphilochus, the son of Amphiaraus, who was himself possessed of prophetic powers (Cic. *de div.* 1. 88, Pausan. 1. 34. 3), after a period of wandering, settled with his followers in Asia Minor. The details of the contest with Mopsus are variously recorded, but all accounts agree that Calchas died from chagrin at his defeat. The preponderance of authority names as the place where the two seers came into conflict the Ionian city of Colophon, which contained the precinct and oracular shrine of the Clarian Apollo: such was the version of the epic *Nosti*[3], of Hesiod (fr. 188), and of Pherecydes (*FHG* 1. 94)[4]. A variant, recorded by Servius on Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 72 on the authority of Euphorion, the Alexandrian poet, locates the contest at the shrine of the Grynean Apollo near Myrina in Aeolis. Herodotus, however, in agreement with Sophocles, preserves the tradition of

[1] In *Nachtr.* p. 293 he referred frs. 176 and 177 to the threatening speech of the Achaean envoy.

[2] Similarly Welcker, p. 123, and Wagner, *Epit. Vat.* p. 259. The story has been fully discussed by Immisch in *Jhrb. f. Phil.* Suppl. XVII 160.

[3] The mention of Tiresias by Proclus is an error (*EGF* p. 53).

[4] The two latter are quoted by Strabo 642: see also Apollod. *epit.* 6. 2—4, Lycophr. 424 ff., Conon 6.

a settlement in Pamphylia (7. 91 : so Pausan. 7. 3. 7, Quint. 14. 369). Callinus (ap. Strabo 668) endeavoured to reconcile the conflicting statements by the supposition that Calchas died at Claros, but that his followers in company with Mopsus crossed the Taurus, and either remained in Pamphylia or scattered in other directions. It would seem that these are the aetiological stories spread by rival sanctuaries, which attest the successive immigrations of Greek settlers.

The Argument to the *Ajax* (p. 3, ed. Jebb) mentions a play entitled Ἑλένης ἁρπαγή, as belonging, together with the *Antenoridae*, *Aechmalotides*, and *Memnon*, to the Τρωϊκὴ πραγματεία. On the assumption that this play is meant, Nauck suggested that it had been confused with the Ἑλένης ἁρπαγή of Alexis, the poet of the Middle Comedy (II 320 K.). On the other hand, Welcker (p. 158 ff.) had no hesitation in supposing that the subject was the recovery of Helen by Menelaus from the house of Deiphobus during the sack of Troy[1]. Whether 'Helen's rape' was a loose mode of referring to Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις is not easy to decide ; but, if a play so entitled had an independent existence, I cannot believe that it dealt with any other matter than the seizure of Helen by Paris[2]. Ahrens and Wagner thought that the Ἑλένης ἁρπαγή described the conflict which arose at Troy after the return of Paris from Sparta, when Antenor and his party vainly advocated the surrender of Helen. But it is improbable that Sophocles wrote a second play so similar in its scope to the Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις.

Hermann's view (*Comm. soc. phil. Lips.* I 247) that this was a satyr-play proceeded on the assumption that Aristides, in the passage quoted in the Introductory Note to the Ἑλένης γάμοι, was referring to the Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις.

176

καὶ γὰρ χαρακτὴρ αὐτὸς ἐν γλώσσῃ τί με
παρηγορεῖ Λάκωνος ὁσμᾶσθαι λόγου.

176. **1** αὐτῆς T, τὸν Λ **2** προσηγορεῖ AMT | ὁρμᾶσθαι CT, ὁρμᾶσαι A, ὁράσθαι M | λόγῳ A

176 Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 301 εἰ γὰρ καὶ Ἑλληνικῶς ἐλάλουν (*sc.* αἱ Φοίνισσαι), ἀλλ' οὖν γε τὴν πάτριον ἴσῳζον ἀπήχησιν τῆς φωνῆς. ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Ἑλένης ἀπαιτήσει 'καὶ γὰρ . . . λόγου.'

Nauck says 'locus nondum emendatus.'

[1] In *Nachtr.* p. 294 he made another guess, founded on the abstract of the *Cypria* (*EGF* p. 10), that, after the refusal of the Trojans to surrender Helen, Achilles desired to see her, and that Aphrodite *conveyed* her from the town to him by the exercise of her magic power, and at the request of Thetis.

[2] Cf. *e.g.* Hdt. 2. 118, and n. on Eur. *Hel.* 50.

and various attempts have been made to improve the text: (1) Herwerden, who formerly proposed *ὀσφρέσθαι* for *ὀσμᾶσθαι*, now also with Gennadius restores *αὐτόθεν γλώσσης* in v. 1; (2) Hermann conjectured *αὐτός*, Gomperz *τραυλός*, Mekler *ἄφατος*, and Blaydes *ἄλλος* (with *ὧν γλώσσης*) for *αὐτός*. The words are not altogether clear, but are defensible, if *ἐν γλώσσῃ* is taken after *ὀσμᾶσθαι*: 'the very ring (of his words) persuades me to scent a trace of the Laconian speech in his talk.' For **χαρακτήρ** cf. Hdt. 1. 142 *χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης τέσσαρες*, Ar. *Pac.* 220 *ὁ γοῦν χαρακτὴρ ἡμεδαπὸς τῶν ῥημάτων*, and for the metaphorical use of *ὀσμᾶσθαι* Ar. *Lys.* 619 *καὶ μάλιστ' ὀσφραίνομαι τῆς Ἱππίου τυραννίδος*, *Nub.* 398 *Κρονίων ὄζων*. H. thinks that the choice of the word **παρηγορεῖ** was suggested by—and intended to suggest—*κατηγορεῖ*, which belongs to the vocabulary of the Physiognomists: see his n. on Aesch. *Ag.* 283. He adds that in Hom. Γ 213 Antenor describes Menelaus' manner of speech on this occasion: *ἤτοι μὲν Μενέλαος ἐπιτροχάδην ἀγόρευεν | παῦρα μὲν ἀλλὰ μάλα λιγέως, ἐπεὶ οὐ πολύμυθος, | οὐδ' ἀφαμαρτοεπὴς* in contrast with Odysseus, whose words were like a shower of snow.

Tucker on *Cho.* 561 uses this passage in support of his view that differences of dialect were actually reproduced on the stage: see however on *Phoen.* 301.

R. Engelmann, *Archäologische Studien*, p. 17, infers that Helen or one of her attendants hears Menelaus speak, and recognizes him as a Laconian from his accent. See also Introductory Note.

177

γυναῖκα δ' ἐξέλοντες ἢ θράσσει γένυν
τε ὡς τοῦ μὲν ἕωλον γραφίοις ἐνημμένοις.

177. **2** ἕωλον] ἑῶλον C, αἰῶλον F, αἴολον O

177 Erotian *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 77, 3 *θράσσει...ἔστι δὲ ὀχλεῖ. ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἑλένης ἀπαιτήσει φησί 'γυναῖκα... ἐνημμένοις'*

1 M. Schmidt proposed *γυναῖκα δὲ ζητοῦντες* (or *δ' ἐξαιτοῦντες*), comparing Ar. fr. 451 1 507 K. *γυναῖκα δὴ ζητοῦντες ἐνθάδ' ἥκομεν*. For *θράσσει* cf. fr. 1055 (n.).

2 This corrupt passage has been emended in various ways, but the true reading appears to be beyond recall. (1) Hermann (*praef.* Eur. *Hel.* p. XIX): *χρῄζουσ' ἕωλον γραφιδίοις ἐνημμένην, muliere potiti, quae pingendo vexat marcidam genam penicillis incensam*, i.e. *rubentem ope penicillorum*. But *ἐνημμένην* in the sense of *inflamed* is very harsh; the usual word would be *ἐντετριμμένην*. Welcker, agreeing generally, preferred to keep *γρ. ἐνημμένοις*, and held that *ἕωλον* must not be pressed too much. Hartung extracts the same sense but reads *ἐγγράφοισιν αἵμασιν* ('mit angemaltem Blut'), comparing *Ant.* 528 *αἱματόεν ῥέθος*. Ahrens, following Hermann's explanation, thinks that the couplet came from Antenor's speech: 'shall we retain a woman like this?' (2) Nauck conjectures *τρωτοῦ Μενέλεω γραβίοις ἐνημμένοις*; *Μενέλεων* had previously been suggested by Bergk, and *γραβίοις* by J. G. Schneider. H. modified this proposal by reading *τρέστου* rather than *τρωτοῦ* (*J. P.* XXIII 272). For the 'craven' Menelaus see his note on Aesch. *Ag.* 125. Blaydes's *τὴν τοῦ Μενελέω γ' ἀρτίως ἠπασμένην* is far from the original and weak in sense. Helen is described as threatening or attempting to burn out Menelaus' eyes with a lighted torch: H. compares Hygin. *fab.* 122 *Electra uti audivit id, truncum ardentem ex ara sustulit, voluitque inscia sorori Iphigeniae oculos eruere.* Prop. 3. 8. 7 *tu minitare oculos subiecta exurere flamma!* For the word *γράβιον* see Athen. 699 E, where Seleucus is quoted as giving the following explanation: *γράβιόν ἐστιν τὸ πρίνινον ἢ δρύινον ξύλον, ὃ περιεθλασμένον καὶ κατεσχισμένον ἐξάπτεσθαι καὶ φαίνειν τοῖς ὁδοιποροῦσιν*. The phrase *γραβίοις ἐνημμένοις* has high probability, but the meaning given to the context is less attractive. Helen with a lighted torch recalls Verg. *Aen.* 6. 518 *flammam media ipsa tenebat | ingentem, et summa Danaos ex arce vocabat;* but it would not be easy to work that idea into the traditional text. (3) R. Ellis in *C. R.* IX 105 proposed *ὀστοῦν θ' ἕωλον γραφιδίοις ἐνειρμένοις*, as a description of a woman picking her teeth with a stylus.

178

ἐμοὶ δὲ λῷστον αἷμα ταύρειον πιεῖν
καὶ μὴ 'πὶ πλεῖον τῶνδ' ἔχειν δυσφημίας.

178. **1** *ταύρειον πιεῖν* Suid., Ar.: *ταύρου γ' ἐκπιεῖν* schol. Ar. **2** *μὴ 'πὶ* Wecklein olim: *μήγε* (*μήτε* Θ) codd., *μή τι* Dindorf, *μὴ ἔτι* Cobet | *πλεῖον* Θ: *πλείω* ceteri codd., *πλείους* Cobet

178 Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 84 *ἔστι γοῦν ἀπὸ Σοφοκλέους Ἑλένης 'ἐμοὶ...δυσφημίας.' τινὲς δέ φασιν ὅτι Σοφοκλῆς περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους τοῦτό φησι. ψεύδονται δέ· οὐ γάρ ἐστι πιθανόν.* Suid. *s.v. νῶν*: (after quoting the text of Aristophanes) *περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους οὖν Σοφοκλῆς φησιν 'ἐμοὶ... πιεῖν.'* The words of Aristophanes (*Eq.* 83 f.) are *βέλτιστον ἡμῖν αἷμα ταύρειον πιεῖν. | ὁ Θεμιστοκλέους γὰρ θάνατος αἱρετώτερος*, and the authority followed by Suidas simply drew an inference from the text of Aristophanes. The origin of the story about Themistocles has now been traced to the misinterpretation of a statue in the market-place of Magnesia: see P. Gardner in *Corolla Numismatica* (in honour of Barclay V. Head) at p. 109, and in *C. R.* XII 21 ff.

Nauck prints this fragment among those of doubtful origin, although he admits that it seems to belong to the *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις*. But Dindorf is justified in definitely assigning it to this play: the evidence is quite as good as we have in most cases, and the words are entirely suitable to Helen's position. The play *Ἑλένης γάμοι* is out of the question.

1 **αἷμα ταύρειον.** For the belief that bull's blood was poisonous, and the possible explanations of its origin see Neil on Ar. *l.c.*, Frazer's *Pausanias*, IV p. 175, and Gruppe, p. 877[11]. According to one version of the story, Aeson the father of Jason was driven by Pelias to suffer death in this way (Apollod. 1. 143, Diod. 4. 50). H. Johnson in *C. R.* XXV 171 suggests that *αἷμα ταύρου* = *menstrua*, on the strength of *ταῦρον· τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον* Phot.

2 *γε* (see cr. n.) would be impossible in this context, and, although *πλείω* might be adverbial (J. quotes Plat. *Phileb.* 45 C *εἰ πλείω χαίρουσιν οἱ σφόδρα νοσοῦντες τῶν ὑγιαινόντων*, *rep.* 417 B *πολὺ πλείω καὶ μᾶλλον δεδιότες τοὺς ἔνδον ἢ τοὺς ἔξωθεν πολεμίους*), the combination of *τι πλείω* is hardly to be tolerated. Blaydes recommends *καὶ μὴ 'τι πλείω...δυσφημίαν*. I prefer to read *ἔτι πλεῖον* in the sense of *any more*, making *τῶνδ'* masculine with probable reference to the Trojans. *O. C.* 1777 *μηδ' ἐπὶ πλείω θυμὸν ἐγείρετε* is now explained as a case of tmesis: no doubt rightly, unless there too we should read *πλεῖον*. [This correction has been anticipated by Wecklein, who suggested *'πὶ πλεῖον τάσδ'* (or *τήνδ'...δυσφημίαν*), but finally preferred *'πὶ πλείω χρόνον* on the ground that *πλεῖον* is not tragic (cf. fr. 774 and Aesch. *Pers.* 793). H., who had arrived at the same conclusion, points out that *ἐπὶ πλέον* is frequent in Thucydides, *e.g.* 1. 65 *ὅπως ἐπὶ πλέον ὁ σῖτος ἀντέχῃ* 'may hold out longer'; so Hdt. 2. 171, 5. 21.] Cobet (*Coll. Crit.* p. 300) well remarks: '*δυσφημίας ἔχειν* dicitur sensu passivo, ut *αἰτίαν ἔχειν*, *ὄνομα*, *ἔπαινον*, *ψόγον ἔχειν*, et similia his alia complura.' For the ambiguity of such expressions contrast *μέμψιν ἔχειν* in Eur. *Heclid.* 974 with *μομφὰν ἔχων* in Soph. *Ai.* 180, and see the comm. on Pind. *Isth.* 3. 54.

179

ἀναχαιτίζει

179 Hesych. 1 p. 186 *ἀναχαιτίζειν· ἀντιθεῖν. ἀναχαλινοῦν. ἀνακρούεται· ἀναπηδίζει. κυρίως δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων. Σοφοκλῆς Ἑλένῃ ἀπαιτήσει.* It seems clear that the lemma has dropped out before *ἀνακρούεται*, *i.e.* *ἀναχαιτίζει*: cf. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 393. 20 *ἀναχετίζει· ἀνακοδίζει, ἐκκόπτει* (l. *ἐγκόπτει*). Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 124, 28 *ἀναχαιτίζει· ἀνακοδίζει, ἀνακόπτει. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἀπειθεῖ καὶ ἀντιτείνει.* Suid. *ἀναχαιτίζει. ἀνακοδίζει, ἐγκόπτει. ἀναχαιτίζειν Σοφοκλῆς*

τὸ ἀπειθεῖν καὶ ἀντιτείνειν. The evidence of Photius and Suidas leads to the conclusion that Sophocles used *ἀναχαιτίζειν* in the sense of *ἀπειθεῖν*, and that there is some confusion in the order of the words as given by Hesychius. The words *κυρίως...ἵππων* (cf. Dion. H. *ant. Rom.* 5. 15 *οἱ ἵπποι...ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀπισθίοις ἀνίστανται ποσὶ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβάτας ἀναχαιτίσαντες ἀποσείονται*) indicate that Soph. recognized the metaphorical sense of which there is a good example in Plut. *Demetr.* 34 *ὡς μὴ πάλιν ἀναχαιτίσαντα τὸν δῆμον ἀσχολίας...παρασχεῖν.* Cf. *Ant.* 291 *κρυφῇ κάρα σείοντες, οὐδ' ὑπὸ ζυγῷ | λόφον δικαίως εἶχον.* The explanations *ἀναποδίζει* and *ἐγκόπτει* no doubt refer to the usage found in Lucian *Lexiph.* 15 *ἀναχαιτίζοι τοῦ δρόμου τὸ ῥόθιον*, of checking the way of a boat. In late Greek *ἀναχαιτίζειν* is often the equivalent of *refrenare* (Phryn. *praep. soph.* p. 32, 8 de B.).

180

[*τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κάλχαντος εἰς Παμφυλίαν μεταφέρει*]

180 Strabo 643 *οἱ δὲ τὸν Κάλχαντά φασιν ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ λύπης καὶ κατά τι λόγιον. λέγει δ' αὐτὸ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἑλένης ἀπαιτήσει, ὡς εἱμαρμένον εἴη ἀποθανεῖν, ὅταν κρείττονι ἑαυτοῦ μάντει περιτύχῃ. οὗτος δὲ καὶ εἰς Κιλικίαν μεταφέρει τὴν ἔριν* (*scil.* of Calchas and Mopsus) *καὶ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κάλχαντος.* Cf. *ibid.* 675 *ἤρισαν περὶ τῆς μαντικῆς ὅ τε Κάλχας καὶ ὁ Μόψος· ταύτην τε γὰρ τὴν ἔριν μεταφέρουσιν ἔνιοι, καθάπερ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς, εἰς τὴν Κιλικίαν, καλέσας ἐκεῖνος αὐτὴν Παμφυλίαν τραγικῶς, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν Λυκίαν Καρίαν καὶ τὴν Τροίαν καὶ Λυδίαν Φρυγίαν. καὶ τὸν θάνατον δὲ τοῦ Κάλχαντος ἐνταῦθα παραδιδόασιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Σοφοκλῆς.*

The various versions of the story relating to the death of Calchas have already been discussed in the Introductory Note. We learn that the distinctive point introduced by Sophocles was the change of scene for the prophetic contest from Claros to Cilicia. On the other hand, in schol. Dionys. Perieg. 850 (*GGM* II 454) Mopsus leads the emigration to Cilicia after the death of Calchas. According to Hesiod (fr. 188 Rz.) Calchas propounded to Mopsus for his solution the question how many figs were growing on a certain tree, and his calculation of the number proved to be absolutely correct. Pherecydes (*FHG* I 95) reported the problem as concerning the size of the litter of a pregnant sow. Other accounts (see Strabo 643) mentioned both problems, stating that Calchas propounded the latter to Mopsus, and that it was answered correctly; but that, when Mopsus submitted the former to him, Calchas failed in his reply, and died of grief, as the oracle had foretold. Further variations on the same theme will be found in schol. Lycophr. 427 and 980; but it is impossible to trace the particular version adopted by Sophocles. Pausanias (7. 3. 7) states that the Pamphylians were of Greek origin, being descended from the companions of Calchas who arrived there in that country after the fall of Troy. For the geographical laxity, by which Pamphylia and Cilicia are confused or identified, we may perhaps compare Aesch. *Supp.* 560 (530) *καὶ δι' ὀρῶν Κιλίκων Παμφύλων τε διορνυμένα*, with Tucker's note. For the common identification of the Trojans with the Phrygians see Jebb on *Ai.* 1054.

ΕΛΕΝΗΣ ΓΑΜΟΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΙΚΟΣ

The character of the play is clearly illustrated by Aristid. II p. 399 Dind., where he is speaking of hypocritical rhetoricians. *εἰ δέ τις αὐτῶν περὶ τῆς ἐγκρατείας διαλεγομένων ἀπαντικρὺ σταίη ἔχων ἔνθρυπτα καὶ στρεπτούς, ἐκβάλλουσι τὴν γλῶτταν ὥσπερ ὁ Μενέλεως τὸ ξίφος* (alluding to Eur. *Andr.* 629: cf. schol. Ar. *Lys.* 155). *αὐτὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐὰν ἴδωσι τὴν Ἑλένην,—Ἑλένην λέγω;*

θεράπαιναν μὲν οὖν ὁποίαν ἐποίησε Μένανδρος *τὴν Φρυγίαν, τῷ ὄντι παιδιὰν ἀποφαίνουσι τοὺς σατύρους τοῦ* Σοφοκλέους. The satyrs, then, were excited with passionate desire at the sight of Helen's beauty.

According to the version of the *Cypria* (*EGF* p. 18), after landing at Sidon (Hom. Z 290) and taking the city, Alexander at length sailed to Troy, where he completed the celebration of his nuptials[1]. But, as Welcker remarks, the scene of the satyr-play was much less likely to be at Troy than before a shady cave or near a babbling brook. I should conjecture, therefore, that the action of the play took place at Cranae, of which Homer speaks as the first resting-place of the lovers:

> *ὅτε σε πρῶτον Λακεδαίμονος ἐξ ἐρατεινῆς*
> *ἔπλεον ἁρπάξας ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσιν,*
> *νήσῳ δ' ἐν Κρανάῃ ἐμίγην φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ* (Γ 443 ff.).

Pausan. 3. 22. 1 identifies Cranae with a small island off Gythium in the Laconian gulf; but Strabo 399 and Lycophr. 110 understand Homer as speaking of Helena, the rocky island stretching along the E. coast of Attica (Eur. *Hel.* 1673 n.).

Welcker suggests that the dance *σκοπός* (*τῶν ἀποσκοπούντων τι σχῆμα*) was suitable to the occasion: see Aesch. frs. 79, 339.

181

> *πέπων ἐρινὸς . . . . . ἀχρεῖος ὢν*
> *ἐς βρῶσιν ἄλλους ἐξερινάζεις λόγῳ.*

181 Athen. 76 C, speaking of *ἐρινὰ σῦκα*, figs of an inferior quality, says that Sophocles in a metaphor applied *ἐρινός*, properly the tree's name, to the fruit: *Σοφοκλῆς δ' ἐν Ἑλένης γάμῳ τροπικῶς τῷ τοῦ δένδρου ὀνόματι τὸν καρπὸν ἐκάλεσεν, εἰπών· 'πέπων ... λόγῳ.' πέπων δ' ἐρινὸς εἴρηκεν ἀντὶ τοῦ πέπον ἐρινόν.* Alexis, he goes on to say, speaks of the fig sellers putting *τὰ σκληρὰ καὶ μοχθηρὰ τῶν σύκων* at the bottom of the basket, and ripe and fine ones on the top, and so *ἐρίν' ἀπέδοτο, σῦκα πωλεῖν ὁμοῦν* (fr. 128, II 343 K.). Eustath. *Il.* p. 1205, 3, quoting avowedly from Athenaeus, says: *ὅτι ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ῥῆμα ἐρινάζειν παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ, ἔνθα τὸν καρπὸν τῷ τοῦ δένδρου ἐκάλεσεν ὀνόματι, εἰπών· 'πέπων ... λόγῳ.' παροιμιακὸν δὲ αὐτὸ [ἡμ. αὐτοῦ] τὸ νόημα, ὅμοιον τῷ 'ἀπαίδευτος ὢν πῶς ἂν ἑτέρους παιδεύσειας;' 'Being uninstructed, how can you instruct others?' He took it therefore to mean 'Since you are yourself worthless, those instructed by your conversation turn out worthless too.'

The explanation of Eustathius is accepted by Brunck, Schweighäuser and Ellendt; and Meineke's version (*Theogn.*[2] p. VII) is practically to the same effect: 'tu ignavae et inutilis caprifici instar alios ut item ignavos et inutiles se praestent oratione persuades.' He omitted *ἀχρεῖος ὢν ἐς βρῶσιν* as an interpolation. On the other hand, Casaubon renders: 'tu cum sis grossus nihili et insipidus, ad comedendum inutilis, alios verbis increpas, tanquam ignavos et insipidos'; and this is also the view of Cobet (*V. L.* p. 289).

[1] See n. on fr. 183.

who, deleting *ἀχρεῖος*, explains by the paraphrase *φαῦλος ὢν ἄλλους ἐκφαυλίζεις*, 'worthless yourself, you make out others to be worthless, speak disparagingly of others.'

H., however, shows that the true meaning has been perceived by Stephanus alone of previous writers: 'nam *ὁ ἐρινός* quod ipse non habet, aliis tribuit,' *i.e. fungeris vice cotis, exsors ipse secandi*, you fertilize others by precept like some Nestor: see Isocrates ap. Plut. *mor.* 838 E. Similar is a proverbial line of an old man marrying (*Paroem.* I p. 390) *γέρων ἐρινὸς εὐφρανεῖ τοὺς γείτονας*, *i.e. αὐτὸς ἀχρεῖος ὤν, ἄλλους ὠφελήσεις*. For wild figs were proverbially useless (hence Spohn restored *ἐρινοί* in Theocr. 15. 50 for the *ἐριοί* or *ἐρειοί* of the MSS). But, though useless in themselves, they were useful for *impregnating* the cultivated: see the Dictt. *s.vv. ἐρινάζω, φηληκόθρεπτος*, or Stein on Hdt. 1. 193. The proverb *ἀνερίναστος εἶ* in Zenob. 2. 23 is differently explained.

The reading in the first line is either defective or interpolated. Porson, holding the former view, conjectured *πέπων ἐρινὸς <ὢς> ἀχρεῖος <αὐτὸς> ὤν*. Casaubon's *αὐτὸς ὢν ἀχρήιος* is impossible. Scaliger inserted *παντελῶς* after *ἐρινὸς* as a stop-gap. On the other hand, Cobet ejected *ἀχρεῖος* as a gloss, and Meineke, as we have seen, suspected the whole phrase *ἀχρεῖος ὢν ἐς βρῶσιν*. So far as the language goes, neither *ἀχρεῖος* nor *βρῶσις* is open to suspicion in tragedy, and *ἐς* is quite normal.

182

νένωται

182 *Etym. M.* p. 601, 23 *νένωται* (so FMV: *νένωται* vulg.) *ἢ κατὰ συγκοπὴν τοῦ η̄ ἀπὸ τοῦ νενόηται...ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ νένωται κατὰ συστολήν. ἔστι γὰρ νῶ ῥῆμα τρίτης συζυγίας ὡς* (*καὶ* F, which Nauck prefers) *παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ, οἷον Ἑλένης γάμῳ νένωται.* Hesych. III p. 148 *νένωται· ἐν νῷ ἔχει.*

Cf. Anacreon fr. 10 *ὁ δ' ὑψηλὰ νενωμένος*. Lobeck (*Path. El.* II p. 114) hesitated whether *νένομαι* or *νένωμαι* should be written in Sophocles and Anacreon; but, as Nauck says, *νένομαι* is an incredible form. For the Ionic contraction of *οη* to *ω* see Weir Smyth's *Ionic Dialect*, pp. 190, 267. In the verbs it is limited to *βοάω* and *νοέω*. There is no other certain example of this contraction in tragedy, but Dindorf read *κἀπιβῶ* for *κἀπιβόα* in Aesch. *Pers.* 1055. See also Jebb on *El.* 882.

183

ὀροσάγγαι

183 Claudius Casilo *παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ῥήτορσι ζητούμενα* in Miller's *Mélanges de litt. gr.* p. 397: *ὀροσάγγαι μὲν οἱ σωματοφύλακες, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Ἑλένη <ς> γάμῳ καὶ Τρωΐλῳ* (fr. 634). The same appears in Phot. *lex.* appendix p. 674, 21, with the omission of *Σοφοκλῆς*.

Sophocles does not appear to have used the name correctly, as according to Hdt. 8. 85 it was the title given to the King's benefactors: cf. fr. 125. Priam appears in tragedy as an oriental despot (Aesch. *Ag.* 926), and the customs at his court are those of the later Persian empire (Eur. *Tro.* 1021). See Dissen on Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 33. H. inferred from this fragment that the scene of the play was at Troy, and that the wedding of Helen to Paris was celebrated after her arrival there. He quoted Proclus's epitome of the *Cypria* (p. 18 Kinkel): *καὶ προσενεχθεὶς Σιδῶνι ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος αἱρεῖ τὴν πόλιν· καὶ ἀποπλεύσας εἰς Ἴλιον γάμους τῇ Ἑλένῃ ἐπετέλεσεν.* Aesch. *Ag.* 707 *τὸ νυμφότιμον μέλος ἐκφάτως τίοντας, | ὑμέναιον, ὃς τόθ' ἑπέρρεπεν | γαμβροῖσιν ἀείδειν.* See, however, Introductory Note.

184

πανόν

184 Phot. *lex.* p. 377, 22 *πανόν· ἀπὸ τοῦ πάντα φαίνειν σχηματισθέντα* (σχηματισθὲν Naber), *κατὰ μεταβολὴν τοῦ φ. Σοφοκλῆς Ἑλένης γάμῳ.* The same derivation is given by Eustath. *Il.* p. 1189, 24 *πανὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ φαίνειν σχηματισθείς, φασί, κατὰ μεταβολὴν τοῦ φ, οἷον 'πανοίχον ἄξαντες φλόγα.'* (Tr. fr. adesp. 160.) Meineke corrected *ἄξαντες* to *ἄψαντες*, but was scarcely justified in his conclusion that Eustathius and Photius were referring to the same passage of Sophocles.

ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΙ

ΕΡΙΦΥΛΗ

The *Epigoni* of Sophocles was one of his most famous plays; and there is consequently a presumption that, when the title *Epigoni* alone is quoted without the name of an author, the play of Sophocles and not that of Aeschylus is meant. The inference may be strengthened by the following considerations. It was customary in the fourth century, when the tragic art was declining, and the age of the actors had succeeded to the age of the poets, to reproduce the plays of the famous dramatists of the earlier period; but it is well known that the practice was for the most part confined to the plays of Sophocles and Euripides, whereas those of Aeschylus were considered too old-fashioned and obscure for the purpose (Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 99). Hence, when we read of the actor Andronicus, with whom Demosthenes studied elocution, having scored a success in the *Epigoni* (Athen. 584 D), we are justified in concluding that the line quoted from that play

ὀλόμενε παίδων, ποῖον εἴρηκας λόγον; (Tr. fr. adesp. 2)

belongs to Sophocles. We arrive at the same result from Cic. *de opt. gen. orat.* 18 *idem Andriam et Synephebos nec minus Terentium et Caecilium quam Menandrum legunt, nec Andromacham aut Antiopam aut Epigonos Latinos reiciunt: immo Ennium et Pacuvium et Accium potius quam Euripidem et Sophoclem legunt.* Since we know that the *Andromache* of Euripides was adapted by Ennius, and the *Antiope* by Pacuvius, the inference is almost inevitable that the *Epigoni* of Sophocles was adapted by Accius. Similarly, when Cicero (*Tusc.* 2. 60) reports: *Cleanthem* (I 607 Arn., p. 328 P.), *cum pede terram percussisset, versum ex Epigonis ferunt dixisse, 'audisne haec, Amphiarae, sub terram abdite?'* (Tr. fr. adesp. 3), we understand at once that the reference is to the *Epigoni* of Sophocles[1].

[1] Wilamowitz, *de tragicorum Graecorum fragmentis*, Gottingen 1893, p. 26, argues briefly to the same effect.

The direct evidence bearing on the plot of the *Epigoni*, scanty as it is, is sufficient to show that the central incident was the murder of Eriphyle, followed by the first beginnings of Alcmaeon's madness. All the authorities lay stress on the command given to his sons by Amphiaraus, when forced by Eriphyle's treachery to join the expedition of the Seven, that when grown to manhood they should exact retribution from their mother: see Apollod. 3. 62, Diod. 4. 66, Hygin. *fab.* 73. But Asclepiades[1] (Schol. V Hom. λ 326, *FHG* III 305) reports this in the form that Alcmaeon was forbidden to join the expedition of the Epigoni until he had put his mother to death; and Alcmaeon was said to have fulfilled the behest. Apollodorus, on the other hand (3. 86), makes the death of Eriphyle subsequent to the return of the Epigoni, stating that Alcmaeon was moved by the discovery of his mother's second act of treachery in accepting the peplos from Thersander, the son of Polynices, as a bribe for persuading her sons to join the expedition, and was also instigated by the oracular command of Apollo. From these facts Bethe inferred the existence of two epic versions in the *Epigoni* and the *Alcmaeonis*; in the former the murder occurred after, and in the latter before the expedition (*Theb. Heldenlieder*, pp. 129, 130 ff., 135 ff.: see also Gruppe, p. 537). Welcker (p. 272) had no hesitation in holding that in Sophocles the murder of Eriphyle preceded the expedition of the Epigoni; and treated the account of Apollodorus, which he regarded as damaging to the character of Alcmaeon, as the work of some later tragedian. This is as may be; but it would be idle to suppose that, if we see reason to place the expedition before the matricide, we are thereby compelled to accept all the details in Apollodorus. Indeed, his story (3. 81) is intrinsically absurd and dramatically impossible. If Alcmaeon was already convinced of the binding force of his father's command, how could he possibly postpone its execution to await the doubtful issue of the siege? 'If I return safe, I will kill my mother'! And was Eriphyle so favourably placed as to be worth bribing? What inducements had she to offer which could have the slightest effect upon a determined enemy? Or, if she could persuade him to spare her life—if only for a season—surely she needed no bribe to make her undertake the task. The whole account is nonsense, unless we suppose that Alcmaeon was *not yet aware of his father's command*[2]. On the other hand, Welcker's view has to meet the

[1] The work of Asclepiades bore the title τραγῳδούμενα, and it might seem natural to ascribe his version to Sophocles without more ado. But the character of his book does not warrant the inference that he abstracted existing plays: see Wenzel in Pauly-Wissowa II 1628.

[2] Immisch, however, contends that Apollodorus followed the *Alcmaeon* of Euripides, and finds in fr. 70 a trace of the discussion between Eriphyle and her son.

difficulty that, if the Erinyes assailed Alcmaeon at once, he must have become incapable of taking the supreme command. After the death of Eriphyle his first object would have been to procure expiation; and, if any weight may be given to the fragments of Accius' *Epigoni*, it appears that after the matricide Alcmaeon sought to appease the offended powers by lustration and sacrifice: see fr. IX *apud abundantem antiquam amnem et rapidas undas Inachi*, X *nunc pergam ut suppliciis placans caelitum aras expleam*. Since the Argives are described as eager for war (fr. III), it might be thought that the siege and capture of Thebes took place during the course of the play—a possibility not lightly to be rejected, for which the *Supplices* of Euripides provides an adequate parallel. Nevertheless, Ahrens and Ribbeck (p. 496) agree with Welcker as to the time of Eriphyle's murder, and the latter suggests that the Furies postponed the execution of their vengeance until their victim should have finished his appointed task. We do not elsewhere find them so obliging[1]. Immisch (*Jahrb. Philol.* Suppl. XVII 180 ff.), who takes the same view, is not justified in supporting it by *postea* as used by Hygin. *fab.* 73 (*Alcmaeon memor patris praecepti Eriphylen matrem suam interfecit. quem postea furiae exagitarunt*). Equally unconvincing is his suggestion that Alcmaeon was healed of his madness by Apollo forthwith, but that it subsequently broke out afresh.

It is highly probable that a dialogue between Alcmaeon and Adrastus, the brother of Eriphyle, took place after the catastrophe, and that the incipient signs of frenzy showed themselves at this point. Since it has been shown that the *Epigoni* of Sophocles was the best-known tragedy dealing with the story of Alcmaeon and Eriphyle, a peculiar significance attaches to the inclusion of Alcmaeon by Antiphanes (fr. 191, II 90 K.) in a list of famous stage-characters:

ἂν πάλιν
εἴπῃ τις Ἀλκμέωνα, καὶ τὰ παιδία
πάντ' εὐθὺς εἴρηχ' ὅτι μανεὶς ἀπέκτονε
τὴν μητέρ', ἀγανακτῶν δ' Ἄδραστος εὐθέως
ἥξει πάλιν τ' ἄπεισι.

There is therefore good reason for following Ribbeck in assigning Tr. fr. adesp. 358 to this play: see p. 69.

[1] If it were legitimate to use Accius in reconstructing Sophocles—and in this case Cicero's statement lends some justification to the attempt—there are several fragments which might be significant, particularly those relating to the appearance of Amphilochus (fr. IV: cf. Apollod. 3. 86, Pausan. 1. 34. 3) and Demonassa (fr. IX: cf. Pausan. 3. 15. 8, 9. 5. 15). By a brilliant conjecture in fr. XVI Bergk introduced a reference to Glisas, the scene of the decisive battle fought between the Epigoni and the Thebans (Pausan. 9. 9. 4).

A difficult and important question remains: was Welcker right in identifying the titles *Epigoni* and *Eriphyle*? Or, in other words, is this a case where the name of a leading character —for we cannot say that Eriphyle was more important than Alcmaeon—has been substituted for the original title? A prima facie case may be made in favour of separation: there are seven unambiguous references to the *Eriphyle*; there is no evidence of an alternative title; and the familiarity of the title *Epigoni* would have been against its displacement. On the other hand, there is much force in Welcker's contention that the tragic death of Eriphyle must have been described in the tragedy which bears her name, and there are several undisputed examples of a mistake arising in the course of the tradition through the substitution for the title of a name taken from the text[1]. On the general question see Introduction, § 1; but this is not a case of isolated error. Rather we should have to suppose that the double title was introduced originally by the grammarians to distinguish the play of Sophocles from the less familiar and differently constructed work of Aeschylus; and that subsequently the anthologists cited only one of the two titles[2]. Fr. 198 might seem to be decisive in Welcker's favour, but, as it is not quoted from the *Eriphyle*[3], there is no reason why, if the occasion required, it should not be transferred to the *Epigoni*. Therefore we can only say that no other solution of the difficulty seems so probable as Welcker's; and his identification has been accordingly accepted in this edition. Jacobs preferred to suppose that the *Eriphyle* related to the earlier expedition of the Seven, that it comprised the quarrel of Amphiaraus and Adrastus and the intervention of Polynices, and that the death of Amphiaraus (cf. fr. 958) was described at the end of the play. This theory cannot be disproved; but is it likely that such a play would have been entitled *Eriphyle*?

There is an obscure reference to the play in Philodem. *de mus.* p. 87 τὸ δ' ἐκ τῶν Ἐπιγόνων μέλος (ὑπογράφομεν οὐκ ἀπιθανωτέραν ἄλλην διάνοιαν, ἀλλ' ἐῶμεν ὡς οὗτος εἶα μετὰ τῆς ἐπισημασίας τοῦ κωμῳδογράφου) μυθικόν ἐστιν. Cf. *ibid.* p. 18 Πινδάρῳ γε γραφέν (γ' ἐγράφετο Usener) 'τὸ κοινόν τις ἀστῶν ἐν εὐδίᾳ τιθείς.' καὶ τὸ Σοφοκλέους ἐν τοῖς Ἐπιγόνοις... The context shows that the opponent against whom Philodemus was arguing brought forward certain instances in which music exercised a soothing influence. The object therefore of the ode in the *Epigoni*

[1] The problem is none the less puzzling, when we find the titles *Epigoni* and *Eriphyle* also ascribed to Accius. Ribbeck (p. 489) takes the same view as Welcker.

[2] See Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 399.

[3] This point is overlooked by Bethe in Pauly-Wissowa VI 462.

was to compose the strife which had arisen between certain of the characters, and probably, as Immisch has pointed out (*Philol.* XLVIII 554), the reference is to the altercation between Alcmaeon and Adrastus after the matricide.

185

ὀλόμενε παίδων, ποῖον εἴρηκας λόγον;

185 Athen. 584 D Ἀνδρονίκου δὲ τοῦ τραγῳδοῦ ἀπ' ἀγῶνός τινος, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς Ἐπιγόνους (τοῖς Ἐπιγόνοις Dobree, ὑποκρινόμενος add. Meineke) εὐημερήκει, πίνειν μέλλοντος παρ' αὐτῇ (sc. Γναθαίνῃ) καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς κελεύοντος τὴν Γνάθαιναν προαναλῶσαι, 'ὀλόμενε παίδων' ἔφη 'ποῖον εἴρηκας λόγον;'

The reasons for attributing this fragment (fr. adesp. 2 N.) to Sophocles have been given in the Introductory Note.

ὀλόμενε, *accursed, wretched*, corresponding to ὄλοιο, is used adjectivally, in the same way as the epic οὐλόμενος. It is an inversion of the historical development to suggest, as some have done, that the participle bore an active meaning. The usage does not recur in Sophocles (subject to a possible reservation in regard to *Ant.* 840), but is found in Aesch. *Prom.* 413, *Suppl.* 855, and several times in Euripides: cf. *Hel.* 232, 385, *Phoen.* 1029, *Or.* 1364, *Med.* 1253, *Her.* 1061 (Wilamowitz).—For the partitive genitive παίδων see on Eur. *Helid.* 567.

186

[*audisne haec, Amphiarae, sub terram abdite?*]

186 Cic. *Tusc.* 2. 60 *Cleanthem* (1607 Arn.), *cum pede terram percussisset, versum ex Epigonis ferunt dixisse, 'audisne haec, Amphiarae, sub terram abdite?'*

Here also the authorship of Sophocles is generally admitted; see Nauck, p. 837. Nauck suggests that the original was κλύεις τάδ', Ἀμφιάραε, γῆς κεύθων κάτω; (after *O. T.* 968, but κρυφθεὶς is just as likely). The chthonic cult of Amphiaraus, especially at Oropus (Frazer, *Pausan.* II 466 ff.), was well-known. Cf. *El.* 836 ff. οἶδα γὰρ ἄνακτ' Ἀμφιάρεων χρυσοδέτοις | ἔρκεσι κρυφθέντα γυναικῶν· καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ γαίας...πάμψυχος ἀνάσσει (with Jebb's nn.). Observe that the appeal to a chthonic power is illustrated by the fact that Cleanthes *struck the ground* with his foot: see *e.g.* Tucker on Aesch. *Cho.* 314, Headlam in *C. R.* XVI 53.

187

ΑΛΚΜ. ἀνδροκτόνου γυναικὸς ὁμογενὴς ἔφυς.
ΑΔΡ. σὺ δ' αὐτόχειρ γε μητρὸς ἥ σ' ἐγείνατο.

187 Plut. *de aud. poet.* 13 p. 35 E ὁ τραγικὸς Ἄδραστος τοῦ Ἀλκμέωνος εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτὸν 'ἀνδροκτόνου...ἔφυς' ἀπεκρίνατο 'σὺ δ'...ἐγείνατο.' Plut. *de utilit. ex inim. percip.* 5 p. 88 F 'ἀνδροκτόνου ἔφυς' πρὸς τὸν Ἄδραστον ὁ Ἀλκμέων· τί οὖν ἐκεῖνος; οὐκ ἀλλότριον ἀλλ' ἴδιον αὐτῷ προφέρων ὄνειδος, 'σὺ δ'...ἐγείνατο.' For the attribution of this fr. to the *Epigoni* see Introductory Note.

1 ἀνδροκτόνου, *husband-slaying*: cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 252 Λαμνιᾶν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων.

2 αὐτόχειρ, in reference to μητρός: see Jebb on *Ant.* 55.—**μητρὸς ἥ σ' ἐγείνατο**, *El.* 261; cf. *Ai.* 1172 πατρὸς ὅς σ' ἐγείνατο, Eur. *Or.* 29, *El.* 964, Aesch. fr. 175.

188

φιλεῖ γὰρ ἡ δύσκλεια τοῖς φθονουμένοις
νικᾶν ἐπ᾽ αἰσχροῖς ἢ ᾽πὶ τοῖς καλοῖς πλέον.

188. **2** ἢ ᵀπο (sic) A, ἢ ᾽πι γρ. A^2

188 Stob. *flor.* 38. 27 (III p. 713, 11 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἐπίγονοι (so M: τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπίπονοι A, S omits the name of the play). '*φιλεῖ...πλέον.*'

This difficult fragment awaits elucidation. Campbell, who remarks that the words are unmeaning in the absence of their context, adds that the general sense seems to be represented by 'He who acts honestly is better able to live down calumny.' This may well be the right track; for envy is said to be powerless against a good man: Eur. fr. 814 *φθόνον οὐ σέβω, | φθονεῖσθαι δὲ θέλομ᾽ ἂν ἐπ᾽ ἐσθλοῖς*, Democrit. fr. 48 Diels *μωμεομένων φλαύρων ὁ ἀγαθὸς οὐ ποιεῖται λόγον*. The meaning of our passage will then be the same as that of an anonymous writer quoted by Stob. *flor.* 38. 39 *φθόνος ὁ κατὰ τῶν εὐδοκιμεόντων ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις ἀργῶν καὶ ἀπρακτῶν· τῶν δὲ ἀγαθῶν καὶ οἷων τε τεκέειν τι παρ᾽ ἑωυτῶν χρηστὸν οὐχ ἅπτεται*. 'When men are attacked by envy, disgrace is wont to prevail, if their deeds are evil and not good.' **τοῖς φθονουμένοις** is thus the dative of the person interested, and with *νικᾶν* used absolutely does not differ essentially from the *dativus iudicantis* (of mental interest only) in Ar. *Av.* 445 *πᾶσι νικᾶν τοῖς κριταῖς | καὶ τοῖς θεαταῖς πᾶσιν*. Tucker wished to substitute *νεικεῖν* for *νικᾶν* and Wecklein *δύσνοια* for *δύσκλεια*, but in either case the interpretation of the lines is hardly less obscure, and in the former there is the additional objection that *νεικεῖν* does not occur in tragedy. Blaydes proposed *ἥκειν* for *νικᾶν*.—For the omission of the article with *αἰσχροῖς*, which has the effect of emphasising *καλοῖς* by way of contrast, cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 495 *ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφοῖς | καὶ τοῖσι φαύλοις ἔνδιχ᾽*, *ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ* (n.), *ib.* 1258 *νίκης τε σῆμα καὶ τὸ τῶν ἡσσωμένων*, *El.* 1351 *οἷσιν δ᾽ ὅσιον καὶ τὸ δίκαιον φίλον ἐν βιότῳ*. See also on fr. 149, 9.

189

ὦ πᾶν σὺ τολμήσασα καὶ πέρα γυνή,
κάκιον ἄλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδ᾽ ἔσται ποτὲ
γυναικός, εἴ τι πῆμα γίγνεται βροτοῖς.

189. **1** *γυνή* MA : *γύναι* S **3** ἢ εἴ (ἦει M) *τι* codd.

189 Stob. *flor.* 73, 51 (IV p. 557, 7 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἐπίγονοι (*ἐπίγονοι* om. S) '*ὦ πᾶν...βροτοῖς.*'

1 I think that Campbell was right in preferring *γυνή* to *γύναι* (see cr. n.), but I do not print a comma after *πέρα* as he does. The nom. is used because the words are an exclamation rather than an address: cf. Hom. A 231 *δημοβόρος βασιλεύς*, *ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις*, and see Monro *H. G.*² § 163.—**καὶ πέρα** is a frigid hyperbole, but is perhaps excusable on the ground that *ὦ πᾶν σὺ τολμήσασα* is virtually identical with *ὦ πάντολμος*, 'O thou who hast been wicked beyond all measure.' For the connotation of *πάντολμος*, a very strong word, see Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 228. There is a similar but less patent hyperbole in Eur. *El.* 1187 *ἅλαστα μέλεα καὶ πέρα | παθοῦσα σῶν τέκνων ὑπαί*. So Jebb takes *O. C.* 1745 *τοτὲ μὲν ἄπορα, τοτὲ δ᾽ ὑπερθεν*. For *πᾶν τολμᾶν* cf. fr. 567 n. The words have not unnaturally been suspected: (1) Meineke conjectured *γυνῆς*, treating vv. 2 and 3 as a separate fragment; (2) Nauck required something like *ὦ δεινὰ τολμήσασα καὶ δεινῶν πέρα* (cf. Dem. 45. 73, Ar. *Av.* 416, *Thesm.* 705); (3) Stadtmueller proposed *πέρα λόγου*. But the text is probably sound.

3 *εἴ τι κτέ.*, 'among all the sorrows

that are men's.' πῆμα logically belongs to the principal clause, but is attracted to the protasis. The common reading is more idiomatic and effective than Tucker's ἢ 'πί (HIII to HITI) πῆμα γίγνεται βροτοῖς, which is an anticlimax. Blaydes conjectured ἤτις. Cf. *O. C.* 1006 εἴ τις γῆ θεοὺς ἐπίσταται | τιμαῖς σεβίζειν, ἥδε τῷδ' ὑπερφέρει. *Trach.* 8 νυμφείων ὄκνον | ἄλγιστον εἶχον, εἴ τις Αἰτωλὶς γυνή. Jebb's objection to the superlative ignores the development of the idiom, which has outstripped its logic. See also on fr. 87.

190

τὸ κοῖλον Ἄργος οὐ κατοικήσοντ' ἔτι

190 κατοικήσονθ' Blaydes : κατοικήσαντ' L (κατοικήσαντα m. pr.)

190 Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 378 πολλαχοῦ τὸ Ἄργος κοῖλον φασι, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν Ἐπιγόνοις 'τὸ κοῖλον.. ἔτι.'

κοίλον. A glance at the map of Argolis will satisfy anyone of the appropriateness of the epithet as a description of the hill-girt Argive valley within the limits of which were situated the ancient towns of Mycenae, Ornease, Midea, and Tiryns: see *O. C.* 378, 1387 with Jebb's n. on the earlier passage, where the reference to this scholium requires correction.—**κατοικήσονθ'.** The aorist (see cr. n.) is unsuitable to ἔτι, and I have very little doubt that the future should be substituted: cf. Eur. *Hel.* 57 τὸ κλεινὸν μ' ἔτι κατοικήσειν πέδον Σπάρτης, *id.* 1244, *Andr.* 858, *Suppl.* 1231. This conjecture has been anticipated by Blaydes. For the critical difficulties affecting the quotations of the scholiast see the n. on fr. 242.

191

γλῶσσ' ἐν κενοῖσιν ἀνδράσιν τιμὴν ἔχει, ὅπου λόγοι σθένουσι τῶν ἔργων πλέον.

191. 1 ἐν κενοῖσιν Jacobs: ἐν οἷσιν L. | ἀνδράσι L. | ἔχει Brunck : ἔχεις L.

191 Stob. *Ecl.* II 15. 27 p. 189, 22 W. Σοφοκλέους Ἐριφόλῃ. 'γλῶσσ'...πλέον.'

1 ἐν κενοῖσιν. I have adopted Jacobs's conjecture as being on the whole the best supplement of the defective text. It seems also to have been made independently by Cobet (*V. L.* p. 15), and is approved by Wachsmuth. Nauck accepts Lindorf's ἐν ὧι = γλώσσ', but strangely enough disregards his ἐν οἷσι which is its necessary complement; for it is extremely unlikely that two relative clauses are quoted by the anthologist and that the main sentence is omitted. Brunck, without remark, gave ἡ γλῶσσ'..., ἔχει, which is open to the same objection. Bamberger conjectured γλῶσσ' ἐν ἐκείνοις. F. W. Schmidt γλῶσσ' ἐν νέοισιν, and Papageorgius γλῶσσ' ἢ 'ν ἐκείνοις (γλῶσσ' ἢ 'ν νέοισιν, Kvičala). Wecklein, retaining ἔχεις, read γλώσσῃ σὺ τοῖσδ' ἐν.

2 ὅπου. On the assumption that ἐν οἷσιν is retained in the previous line, Blomfield proposed to substitute ἐκεῖ. But it is quite unnecessary to read ὅταν (Wagner) or ὅτεις (F. W. Schmidt), since ὅπου may very well follow a personal antecedent: see *Phil.* 456 ὅπου θ' ὁ χείρων τἀγαθοῦ μεῖζον σθένει...τούτους ἐγὼ τοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ στέργω ποτέ. Hdt. 9 1 ὅκου δὲ ἐκάστοτε γίνοιτο, τούτους παρελάμβανε. fr. 314, 324 ff. (n.)—For the sentiment, which is sufficiently common, cf. *O. C.* 1143 οὐ γὰρ λόγοισι τὴν βίου σκοτοῦδ' ἐλαμπρὰν ποιεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς δρωμένοις, Eur. *Suppl.* 907 φιλόπολιν ὄπλοις πλούσιον, φρόνημα δὲ | ἐν τοῖσιν ἔργοις, οὐχὶ τοῖς λόγοις, ἔχων (ἴσον could. Eur.).

192

ὅπου δὲ μὴ τὰ χρήστ' ἐλευθέρως λέγειν
ἔξεστι, νικᾷ δ' ἐν πόλει τὰ χείρονα,
ἁμαρτίαι σφάλλουσι τὴν σωτηρίαν.

192. **1** τὰ χρήστ' Reisig: τὰ ῥᾴστα vel τὰ ῥᾶστα codd., τἄριστ' Wyttenbach, τὰ λῷστ' Blomfield **3** ἁμαρτίαι S: ἁμαρτίαις MA

192 Stob. *flor.* 43. 7 (IV p. 2, 17 Hense) τοῦ αὐτοῦ ([following fr. 84] SA, Σοφοκλέους M) Ἐριφύλη. 'ὅπου... σωτηρίαν.'

1 f. Reisig's conjecture (see cr. n.) appears most appropriate to the context. Cf. *Phil.* 456 ὅπου θ' ὁ χείρων τἀγαθοῦ μεῖζον σθένει | κἀποφθίνει τὰ χρηστὰ χὠ δειλὸς κρατεῖ, | τούτους ἐγὼ τοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ στέρξω ποτέ. Observe, however, that here the neuter τὰ χείρονα is not used for the masculine, as τὰ χρηστά is there. The schol. on that passage refers to Hom. A 576 ἐπεὶ τὰ χερείονα νικᾷ and to Hes. *Op.* 193 βλάψει δ' ὁ κακὸς τὸν ἀρείονα φῶτα, and the former of these quotations is certainly echoed here. Homer's phrase became proverbial at a later date: Niceph. Chumn. ap. Boisson. *anecd. nov.* p. 68 πλεονεκτεῖ δ' ὅμως ἐν τούτῳ τὰ χείρω, καὶ μῖσος ἀγάπης, καὶ ἔχθρα φιλίας. Theodor. Metoch. *misc.* 58 p. 341 καίτοι τί λέγω, εἰ τὰ χείρω, κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ἀεὶ νικᾷ, κἂν πάσῃ κράσει τῶν ἐναντίων τῶν ἀνιώντων μᾶλλον αἰσθανόμεθα; χρηστός and χείρων are both employed in the political or social sense to express the opposition of the conservative and democratic parties, and the neuter plural might be applied to their respective policies: Eur. *Or.* 773 ἀλλ' ὅταν χρηστοὺς λάβωσι (*sc.* προστάτας οἱ πολλοί), χρηστὰ βουλεύουσ' ἀεί. See Grote, *Hist.* iii p. 45, Neil's *Equites*, p. 202 ff. But here the meaning may be quite general.—Herwerden unnecessarily suspects ἐν πόλει on the ground that after ὅπου it is tautologous, and proposes ἐν λόγοις. But the paratactic redundancy is idiomatic: see Jebb's Appendix on *O. C.* 434.

193

γήρᾳ προσῆκον σῷζε τὴν εὐθυμίαν.

193 προσῆκον Gaisford: προσηκόντως A, προσόντως M, προσόντος vulgo, πρεπόντως Nauck | εὐθυμίαν Dindorf: εὐφημίαν codd.

193 Stob. *flor.* 117. 3 (IV p. 1055, 4 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἐριφύλη. 'γήρᾳ... εὐφημίαν.'

This is a difficult fragment and involves the questions, (1) how the second word is to be read, and (2) whether εὐφημίαν is sound. (1) Brunck printed γήρως προσόντος, but Dindorf reports him as favouring προσήκων, which was adopted by Hartung. But γήρᾳ προσήκων can hardly mean 'having reached' or 'approached old age.' Bergk proposed προήκων. Recently Nauck's πρεπόντως has won some acceptance, but, although πρεπόντως and προσηκόντως were synonymous words, it is improbable that at any period the former would have been explained by the latter. The indications are rather the other way: see *Etym. M.* p. 690, 21 προσῆκον· τὸ πρέπον, Suid. προσήκει. πρέπει. Blaydes's παροικῶν has no probability. For these reasons I prefer Gaisford's προσῆκον as an acc. abs.: for its use in tragedy cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 472. (2) εὐφημίαν cannot mean 'silence'; the last thing that was expected from the old was to refrain from speech. If, on the other hand, we translate 'good name,' there is not much point in urging an old man to be careful of his reputation; and there would be no inducement for the anthologist to include the line under the title ὅτι τὸ γῆρας ἀνεπαχθὲς καὶ πολλῆς αἰδοῦς ἄξιον ἡ σύνεσις ἀπεργάζεται. We expect something that is relevant to the general defence of old age. F. W. Schmidt's εὐβουλίαν and εὐρυθμίαν have very little probability; and I think Dindorf's εὐθυμίαν is far better, both for palaeographical reasons and in point of sense. Old age is not burdensome, if it is borne with composure: cf. Plat. *rep.* 329 D ἂν μὲν γὰρ κόσμιοι καὶ εὔκολοι ὦσιν (*scil.* οἱ ἄνθρωποι), καὶ τὸ γῆρας μετρίως ἐστὶν ἐπίπονον· εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ γῆρας καὶ νεότης χαλεπὴ τῷ τοιούτῳ συμβαίνει. Anaxandr. fr. 53, II 159 K.

194

ἀρετῆς βέβαιαι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ κτήσεις μόνης.

194 *μόνης* Naber: *μόναι* M

194 Stob. *flor.* 1. 1 (III p. 1, 3 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς *ἐν* Ἐριφύλῃ. '*ἀρετῆς... μοναι.*' The extract is omitted by SA, appearing only in M.

The contrast is between the permanence of *ἀρετή* as a natural endowment, and the instability of wealth. It is explicit in Theogn. 317 *τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν πλοῦτον, ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἔμπεδον αἰεί, | χρήματα δ' ἀνθρώπων ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει.* The possession of *ἀρετή* is a gift of *φύσις*: see on fr. 808 and the illustrations quoted by Headlam in *J. P.* XXIII 276, especially Eur. *El.* 941 *ἡ γὰρ φύσις βέβαιος, οὐ τὰ χρήματα.* Sophocles, one may think, would have been on the side of Pindar with his contempt for *διδακταὶ ἀρεταί* (*Ol.* 9. 101) rather than on that of Socrates: contrast Critias fr. 9 Diels *ἐκ μελετῆς πλείους ἢ φύσεως ἀγαθοί.* In later times the Stoics discussed the question whether virtue once acquired could be lost.—**βέβαιαι.** The only other instance in tragedy of the fem. termination appears to be Eur. *El.* 1263. Blaydes proposed to substitute *βέβαιοι.*

195

ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐσθλῶν στέρνον οὐ μαλάσσεται.

195 Stob. *flor.* 7. 7 (III p. 309, 13 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Ἐριφύλῃ. '*ἀνδρῶν... μαλάσσεται.*'

A similar line is quoted from Menand. *monost.* 31 *ἀνδρὸς πονηροῦ σπλάγχνον οὐ μαλάσσεται*, but the application is different. The good man is unshaken in courage, but the bad man is impervious to pity. It should be remembered that *θυμός* comprehends both anger and courage (cf. Plato's *θυμοειδές*), so that in common speech the separating line was not clearly drawn. For the softening of anger cf. Eur. *Alc.* 771 *ὀργὰς μαλάσσουσ' ἀνδρός.* The present passage is more akin to *Or.* 1200 (referring to the cowardly Menelaus) *καί νιν δοκῶ...χρόνῳ μαλάξειν σπλάγχνον. οὔτε γὰρ θρασὺν | οὔτ' ἄλκιμος πέφυκε.* I cannot therefore agree with Nauck, who would restore *οὐκ ἀλλάσσεται* after Naber and F. W. Schmidt. If any change were necessary, it would be better to adopt Wecklein's suggestion that the line was interrogative; but the tradition indicates that the subject was courage. The figurative use of *στέρνον*, as applied to the emotions, is peculiar to Sophocles: see *Trach.* 482, *O. C.* 487.

196

πῶς οὖν μάχωμαι θνητὸς ὢν θείᾳ τύχῃ,
ὅπου τὸ δεινὸν ἐλπὶς οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ;

198 Stob. *flor.* 99. 20 (IV p. 863, 7 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Ἐριφύλῃ. '*πῶς... ὠφελεῖ;*'

Hope is the common sustenance of men (fr. 948), and their solace in time of danger: Thuc. 3. 103 *ἐλπὶς κινδύνῳ παραμυθίων οὖσα* is an exact parallel to v. 2. So long as the issue is undecided, hope may be cherished (*Trach.* 723 f. *παρεῖσιν μὲν ἔργα δεινὰ ἀναγκαίως ἔχει, | τὴν δ' ἐλπίδ' οὐ χρὴ τῆς τύχης κρίνειν πάρα*); but it is powerless against divine intervention: Aesch. *Suppl.* 103 *λάπτει δ'* (*sc.* Ζεύς) *ἐλπίδων ἄφ' ὑψιπέργων πανώλεις ἄρτους.* But the best illustration of the text will be found in Dem. 18. 97 *δεῖ δὲ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ἐγχειρεῖν μὲν ἅπασιν ἀεὶ τοῖς καλοῖς, τὴν ἀγαθὴν προβαλλομένους ἐλπίδα, φέρειν δ' ἂν ὁ θεὸς διδῷ γενναίως.* Ribbeck (p. 491) thinks that these are the words of Alcmaeon surrendering himself to his fate; and Immisch, comparing Accius fr. VI *qui, nisi genitorum mi so, nullum meis dat*

finem miseriis, infers that in this play Alcmaeon was acting according to the direction of the oracle, and not merely in execution of his father's behest. The sense is grievously marred by Nauck's punctuation (adopted by Dindorf and Campbell), who makes the question end at *τύχῃ*, puts a comma after *δεινόν*, and a full-stop after *ὠφελεῖ*. Hence, inasmuch as v. 2 then becomes contrary to fact—for hope is often serviceable in danger—Bergk and Kock conjectured *ὅπου τὸ θεῖον*, and F. W. Schmidt *ὅπου τὸ δεινὸν ἐνέπεσ', οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ*. The reason for this mistaken criticism is that *ὠφελεῖν* is supposed to require a personal objec ; but Tucker has well shown (*C. R.* XVIII 197) that this is not the case by quoting Eur. fr. 274 *τὸ γὰρ ἐπιεικὲς ὠφελεῖ τὰς ξυμφοράς* and fr. 714 *πλοῦτος ὠφελεῖ νόσον*.

1 **θεία τύχη**, 'heaven-sent doom.' Sophocles is fond of this use of *θεῖος*. which is illustrated on fr. 650. The meaning of *θεοῦ πληγή* (fr. 961 n.) is similar. For the general sense, the necessity of submitting to the divine ordinance, see on fr. 585.

2 **τὸ δεινόν** is used as in fr. 351, *O. T.* 722 *τὸ δεινὸν οὐφοβεῖτο*.

197

ἄπελθε· κινεῖς ὕπνον ἰατρὸν νόσου.

197 *ἄπελθ' ἐκείνης* codd. : corr. Nauck | *ἰητρὸν* codd.

197 Clem. Alex. *strom.* 6 p. 741 *λάβοις δ' ἂν ἐκ παραλλήλου...Εὐριπίδου μὲν ἐκ τοῦ 'Ορέστου* (211) *'ὦ φίλον ὕπνου θέλγητρον, ἐπίκουρον νόσου,' Σοφοκλέους δὲ ἐκ τῆς 'Εριφύλης 'ἄπελθ' ἐκείνης ὕπνον ἰητρὸν νόσου.'*

The text is corrupt, but it is not easy to decide between Valckenaer's *ἄπελθ'· ἐκείνης ὕπνος ἰατρὸς νόσου*, and Nauck's *ἄπελθε· κινεῖς ὕπνον ἰατρὸν νόσου*. The latter quotes Eur. *Bacch.* 690 *ἐξ ὕπνου κινεῖν δέμας*, and objects to *ἐκείνης*—on the ground, I suppose, that to particularize is beside the mark. For sleep as a soother of pain cf. *Phil.* 827 *Ὕπν' ὀδύνας ἀδαής, Ὕπνε δ' ἀλγέων*. Orph. *h.* 85. 5 Abel *λυσιμέριμνε, κόπων ἡδεῖαν ἔχων ἀνάπαυσιν, | καὶ πάσης λύπης ἱερὸν παραμύθιον ἔρδων* (al. *ἕρπων*). Wilamowitz (Eur. *Her.*[2] I p. 138) plausibly infers that the reference is to Alcmaeon asleep on the stage, and that here, as in the *Orestes* and *Heracles* of Euripides, sleep was introduced as succeeding a fit of madness.

198

καὶ γὰρ 'Αργείους ὁρῶ

198 Prov. cod. Athoi in Miller, *Mélanges de litt. gr.* p. 363 (II 46) *καὶ γὰρ 'Αργείους ὁρῶ· καὶ αὕτη Σοφοκλείου ἐστὶν ἰαμβείου μέρος· πεποίηται γὰρ ἐκεῖ 'Εριφύλη* (*περιφυλῆ* cod.) *πρὸς 'Αλκμαίωνα λέγουσα 'καὶ γὰρ 'Αργείους ὁρῶ.' μέμνηται ταύτης Αλεξις ἐν Μυλωθρῷ* (fr. 153, II 353 K.). *Proverb. Append.* 3. 35 (*Paroem.* I 423) *καὶ γὰρ 'Αργείους ὁρᾷς· αὕτη Σοφόκλειος. πεποίηται γὰρ 'Εριφύλη πρὸς 'Αλκμαίωνα λέγουσα 'καὶ...ὁρῶ.' εἴρηται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκτενῶς πρὸς ὀτιοῦν βλεπόντων καὶ καταπληκτικόν τι δοκούντων ὁρᾶν. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς κλοπὴν ὑπονοουμένων· κωμῳδοῦνται γὰρ 'Αργεῖοι ἐπὶ κλοπῇ, ὥσπερ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς* (a manifest error for *Αλεξις*, according to Crusius) *ἐχρήσατο*. Hesych. I p. 272 *'Αργείους ὁρῶ· παροιμιῶδες*. Suid. *s.v.* *'Αργείους ὁρᾷς. παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἀτενῶς καὶ καταπληκτικῶς ὁρώντων*.

Crusius (*Analecta Critica*, p. 151) explains that the comic poet quoted the words of Sophocles with the addition *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* of *τοὺς φῶρας* or something of the kind, so that *ἀργεῖος* bears the meaning of *φανερός* (cf. *ἀργός*). He points out that Aristophanes had also spoken of 'Argive thieves' with the same intention : Suid. *s.v.* *'Αργεῖοι φῶρες· ἐπὶ τῶν προδήλως πονηρῶν· οἱ 'Αργεῖοι ἐπὶ κλοπῇ κωμῳδοῦνται. 'Αριστοφάνης 'Αναγύρῳ* (fr. 57, I 406 K.). The verbal play is of the same kind as *βοῦς Κύπριος* (*κόπριος*), *κακῶν 'Ιλιάς* (*ὕλη*), *δαίμων Αἰνειος* (*αἰνός*), and a number of others: *ibid.* p. 55. That this use of *ἀργός* was possible is shown by one of the derivations given to *'Αργειφόντης, i.e. τρανῶς ἀποφαινόμενος* (Hesych. I p. 273). Thus, the two explanations in *Prov. Append.* 3. 35

(εἴρηται δὲ...οἱ δὲ...) are adapted respectively to the quotations from Sophocles and Alexis. The same critic (*Philol.* XLVI 616) refers to this passage Aristophon fr. 4, II 277 K. παλαιστὴν νόμισον Ἀργεῖον μ' ὁρᾶν. Blaydes compares Ar. *Ran.* 653 ἱππέας ὁρῶ, put forward to explain a cry of pain.

The words were spoken by Eriphyle to Alcmaeon, and were famous as having occurred at the culminating point of a scene marked by the most intense form of tragic emotion. Eriphyle was conscious of having betrayed the expedition of Adrastus, and the appearance—real or imagined—of the Argives was calculated to fill her with terror. Ribbeck, p. 494, thought that Eriphyle implored Alcmaeon to stay his hand, declaring that she could see an Argive army hurrying forward to intervene in her favour; but this interpretation is excluded by the words τῶν καταπληκτικόν τι δοκούντων ὁρᾶν.

ΕΡΙΣ

The reading Ἶρις in Athen. 646 D, preferred by Casaubon, Brunck, and Boeckh as the title of this play, is now exploded. Welcker (*Nachtr.* p. 313), quoting Plat. *rep.* 379 E θεῶν ἔριν τε καὶ κρίσιν διὰ Θέμιτός τε καὶ Διός, conjectured that the subject was the contention between Zeus and Poseidon for the hand of *Themis*. This strange blunder is reproduced by Dindorf without any intimation that Welcker had confused Themis and Thetis: cf. Pind. *Isth.* 8. 27 Ζεὺς ὅτ' ἀμφὶ Θέτιος ἀγλαΐᾳ τ' ἔρισαν Ποσειδᾶν γάμῳ.

I would rather suppose that the Ἔρις was a companion-play to the Κρίσις, and that its subject was the strife between the three goddesses at the marriage of Peleus and Thetis. See Proclus's abstract of the *Cypria* (*EGF* p. 17): παραγενομένη δὲ Ἔρις εὐωχουμένων τῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς Πηλέως γάμοις νεῖκος περὶ κάλλους ἐνίστησιν Ἀθηνᾷ Ἥρᾳ καὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ, αἳ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν Ἴδῃ κατὰ Διὸς προσταγὴν ὑφ' Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἄγονται κτέ. The golden apple which Eris dropped on the table with its inscription 'A gift to the fairest' is mentioned by a number of the later authorities (collected by Waser in Pauly-Wissowa VI 465), and several critics have inferred that it was an addition to the original story. Though omitted by Proclus, the apple appears in the very much abbreviated account in Apollod. *epit.* 3. 2, and there is nothing to prove that it could not have been mentioned in a satyr-play of Sophocles. It is obvious that the marriage of Peleus and Thetis was an occasion on which a chorus of satyrs might very well have been present, and the fragments, so far as they go, support the idea of a banquet. Two considerations which make in favour of this conjecture deserve to be stated. (1) the frequency with which ἔρις, especially in conjunction with κρίσις,

[1] See Gruppe, p. 665.

appears as a fixed term for the quarrel of the three goddesses, as in the Argument to Colluthus, *ἁρπαγὴ Ἑλένης: τὴν τῆς Ἔριδος σύγχυσιν καὶ ἔριν περὶ τοῦ μήλου.* Cf. Eur. *Hec.* 644 *ἐκρίθη δ' ἔρις ἂν ἐν Ἰδᾳ κρίνει τρισσὰς μακάρων | παῖδας ἀνὴρ βούτας.* *Andr.* 276 *τρίπωλον ἅρμα δαιμόνων | ἄγων* (*sc.* Hermes) *τὸ καλλιζυγές, | ἔριδι στυγερᾷ κεκορυθμένον εὐμορφίας.* *Hel.* 708 *θεῶν τρισσῶν ἔρις.* *I.A.* 183 *Ἥρᾳ Παλλάδι τ' ἔριν ἔριν | μορφᾶς ἁ Κύπρις ἔσχεν.* *ib.* 1307 *κρίσιν ἐπὶ στυγνὰν ἔριν τε καλλονᾶς.* Isocr. 10. 41 *γενομένης ἐν θεοῖς περὶ κάλλους ἔριδος, ἧς Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πριάμου κατέστη κριτής.* There is very little doubt that to this list should be added the passage of Plato quoted by Welcker, seeing that Themis is mentioned in the abstract of Proclus as taking counsel with Zeus: see Adam's note. (2) If Ἔρις is to be taken as a personification, the incident in question is much the most famous affair in which she was engaged[1].

199

ἐγὼ δὲ πεινῶσ' αὖ πρὸς ἴτρια βλέπω.

199 πεινωσαγαυ A: corr. Musurus

199 Athen. 646 D *ἴτριον πεμμάτιον λεπτὸν διὰ σησάμου καὶ μέλιτος γινόμενον. μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ...Σοφοκλῆς Ἐριδι 'ἐγὼ... βλέπω.'*

πρὸς ἴτρια βλέπω, 'cast a longing eye on the cakes,' is a less contemptuous form of the Aristophanic *πρὸς ταῦτα κεχηνώς* (*Nub.* 997). Cf. Plat. *symp.* 181 B *πρὸς τὸ διαπράξασθαι μόνον βλέποντες.* Blaydes on Ar. *Lys.* 427 quotes Eur. fr. 162 *ἀνδρὸς δ' ὁρῶντος εἰς Κύπριν νεανίου,* Theocr. 13. 12 *οὔθ' ὑπόκ' ὀρτάλιχοι μινυροὶ ποτὶ κοῖτον ὀρῶεν.* So perhaps *Ant.* 30 *εἰσορῶσι πρὸς χάριν βορᾶς.* For *ἴτρια* cf. Anacreon fr. 17 *ἠρίστησα μὲν ἰτρίου λεπτοῦ μικρὸν ἀποκλάς.*—Kaibel questions whether the generally accepted correction of Musurus (see cr. n.) is sound. It is certainly not convincing, but nothing better has been suggested.—Ahrens thought that Aphrodite was the speaker, and that she was bored with Athena's sage counsel.

200

εὔωρος γάμου

200 γάμος cod.: corr. Nauck

200 Hesych. II p. 237 *εὔωρος γάμος. Σοφοκλῆς Ἐριδι. ἤτοι ὥριος* (*ὡραῖος* Nauck) *ἡ ὀλίγωρος. οὕτω γὰρ λέγουσι κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν Σκυρίαις* (fr. 561) *χρῆται τῷ εὐωριάζειν.*

Nauck pointed out that the interpretation *ὀλίγωρος*, although wrong in itself, shows that *γάμου* and not *γάμος* is the correct reading. An example of *εὔωρος* in the sense of 'neglectful' is quoted from Euphor. fr. 102 *οὐδέ τοι εὔωροι θυέων.*

Hesych. also mentions *εὔωρος* as an epithet of *γῆ, i.e. ἡ γῆ ὡραῖα ἔχουσα.* For the genitive depending on the adj. cf. Eur. *Hel.* 12 *ἐπεὶ δ' ἐς ἥβην ἦλθεν ὡραίαν γάμων* (n.), and for further illustrations of similar genitives Kuehner-Gerth I 371. Pierson on Moeris p. 426. For *κατ' ἀντίφρασιν* see on fr. 116.

[1] When the above was written, I was unaware that the same view of the contents of the *Ἔρις* had been advocated by Bergk (*de frag. Soph.* p. 10), as well as by Ahrens, who threw out the suggestion that possibly *Ἔρις* was an alternative title to the play known as *Κρίσις*. The latter identification, for which there is little to be said, was also approved by Wagner.

201

μίαν μίαν

201 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 108, 9 *μίαν μίαν· ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ μίαν.* Σοφοκλῆς Ἐμβδι.

It must be assumed that this was a colloquialism for 'one by one,' or 'one and then another.' Brunck compares Ar. *Vesp.* 213 *τί οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθημεν ὅσον ὅσον στίλην;* So *μᾶλλον μᾶλλον* in Eur. *I. T.* 1406 *μᾶλλον δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς πέτρας ἥει σκάφος*, and see Phot. *lex.* p. 244, 21. Ar. *Nub.* 1288 *πλέον πλέον τἀργύριον ἀεὶ γίγνεται.* Antiph. fr. 10, II 15 K. *μεῖζον μεῖζον.* Catull. 64. 275 *magis magis increbrescunt.* Examples from modern Greek are adduced in the authorities quoted by Thumb, *die gr. Spr. in Zeitalter d. Hellenismus*, p. 128.

ΕΡΜΙΟΝΗ

The plot of this play proceeds on parallel lines to that of Euripides' *Andromache.* Our authorities for the contents are as follows: Eustath. *Od.* p. 1479, 10 *Σοφοκλῆς δέ, φασίν, ἐν Ἑρμιόνῃ ἱστορεῖ ἐν Τροίᾳ ὄντος ἔτι Μενελάου ἐκδοθῆναι την Ἑρμιόνην ὑπὸ τοῦ Τυνδάρεω τῷ Ὀρέστῃ· εἶτα ὕστερον ἀφαιρεθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ ἐκδοθῆναι τῷ Νεοπτολέμῳ κατὰ τὴν ἐν Τροίᾳ ὑπόσχεσιν· αὐτοῦ δὲ Πυθοῖ ἀναιρεθέντος ὑπὸ Μαχαιρέως, ὅτε τον Ἀπόλλω τινύμενος τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξεδίκει φόνον, ἀποκαταστῆναι αὖθις αὐτὴν τῷ Ὀρέστῃ· ἐξ ὧν γενέσθαι τὸν Τισαμενὸν φερωνύμως οὕτω κληθέντα παρὰ την μετὰ μένους τίσιν, ἐπεὶ ὁ πατὴρ Ὀρέστης ἐτίσατο τοὺς φονεῖς τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος.* The schol. on δ 4 is identical in substance, though the language is somewhat different, and the clause *ὅτε...φόνον* and all that follows *Τισαμενόν* are omitted. But *ὑπὸ Τυνδάρεω* is given in the MSS in place of *ὑπὸ Μαχαιρέως*, which is restored by Dindorf. The only other allusion to Sophocles in relation to this subject occurs in schol. Eur. *Or.* 1655 which, after some remarks concerning Euripides alone, proceeds as follows: *Φερεκύδης φησὶ (FHG* I 94) *περὶ παιδων χρησμὸν αἰτοῦντα τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ἀναιρεθῆναι· ἐπει Νεοπτολεμος Ἑρμιόνην γαμεῖ τὴν Μενελάου, καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Δελφοὺς περὶ παίδων χρησόμενος· οὐ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐγένοντο ἐξ Ἑρμιόνης. καὶ ὁρῶν κατὰ τὸ χρηστηριον κρέα διαρπάζοντας τοὺς Δελφούς, ἀφαιρεῖται τὰ κρέα αὐτούς, ἑαυτὸν δὲ κτείνει μαχαίρᾳ. ὁ δὲ τούτων ἱερευς (αὐτὸν δὲ κτεινει Μαχαιρεὺς ὁ τουτων ἱερεὺς καὶ* conj. Leopardi) *κατορυσσει αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐδὸν τοῦ νεώ. ταῦτα γενεαλογεῖ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς.* It is not at all clear what meaning should be given to the cryptic utterance in the last sentence; but I cannot agree with Welcker (p. 220 ff.) that we are entitled to assume that Sophocles followed the account of Pherecydes in respect either (1) to the

motive of Neoptolemus in visiting Delphi[1], or (2) to the origin of the brawl with the priests. Welcker makes several other assumptions which cannot be justified: that Orestes plotted against the life of Neoptolemus, as in Euripides; that the scene of the play was laid at Delphi; that Hermione was forcibly carried off by Neoptolemus, and sighed for her former lover Orestes, as in Ovid (*Her.* 8); that Pylades assisted Orestes in attacking Neoptolemus; and that Neoptolemus in a dying speech directed that Andromache should be sent to Helenus. There is not a scrap of evidence to support these inferences; and it is far better to adhere strictly to the statement of Eustathius, who is our only explicit authority. A tragedy upon this subject was also written by Philocles[2], who is known to us from several allusions in Aristophanes: see schol. on Eur. *Andr.* 32. The title *Hermione* is also found among the works of Livius Andronicus and Pacuvius; and several fragments of the latter's play are preserved, and are used by Welcker for the purpose of reconstructing the play of Sophocles[3]. The objections to this method have been pointed out in several other cases.

The principal facts which emerge from the statement of Eustathius are: (1) the betrothal of Hermione by Tyndareus, during the absence of Menelaus at Troy. For this cf. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 3. 328 *hanc Hermionam quidam dicunt, cum Oresti esset desponsata, post a Menelao apud Troiam admirante virtutem Pyrrhi esse promissam: alii dicunt a Menelao quidem apud Ilium Pyrrho desponsatam; sed a Tyndareo Oresti morante apud Troiam Pyrrho, ut quidam promissam, ut quidam coniunctam tradunt.* Ov. *Her.* 8. 31 *me tibi Tyndareus, vita gravis auctor et annis, tradidit: arbitrium neptis habebat avus; | at pater Aeacidae promiserat inscius acti*, etc. To the same effect Hygin. *fab.* 123. (2) Neoptolemus was slain by Machaereus at Delphi. This is related by several authorities, from whom we learn that Machaereus was one of the priests of Apollo: cf. Strabo 421 *Μαχαιρέως Δελφοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀνελόντος αὐτόν, ὡς μὲν ὁ μῦθος, δίκας αἰτοῦντα τὸν θεὸν τοῦ πατρῴου φόνου, ὡς δὲ τὸ εἰκός, ἐπιθέμενον*

[1] Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.* p. 262, agrees with Welcker, and actually attributes the introduction of the words *ταῦτα* (or *ταὐτὰ*) *γενεαλογεῖ* to the operation of this motive. More to the point is his reference to Diog. L. 1. 119, where Pherecydes himself is called *γενεαλόγος*. Wagner (*Epit. Vat.* p. 276$_2$) was perhaps right in referring the words to the genealogy of Tisamenus, as related at the end of the play.

[2] See *TGF* p. 760, where it is hinted that the name of Philocles may have been substituted in error for that of Sophocles.

[3] Wagner and Ribbeck make much of Pacuv. fr. 1 *quo tandem ipsa orbitas grandaevitasque Pelei penuriam | stirpis subauxit*, as confirming the view of Welcker that in Sophocles Neoptolemus went to Delphi to enquire how he might become a father. It is manifest that the words quoted do not warrant the inference that has been drawn from them.

τῷ ἱερῷ. Pausan. 10. 24. 4 Νεοπτόλεμον...ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπέκτεινε τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. Tryphiod. 642 ζαθέου δηλήμονα νηοῦ | Δελφὸς ἀνὴρ ἐλάσας ἱερῇ κατέπεφνε μαχαίρῃ. It is important to observe that the schol. on Pind. *Nem.* 7. 62, quotes Asclepiades' τραγῳδούμενα (*FHG* III 303) in support of his remark that all the poets agree in naming Machaereus as responsible for the death of Neoptolemus. Pindar, in his *Paean* to the Delphians (6. 118, *Oxyrh. Pap.* V 47), had given offence to the Aeginetans by the words ἀμφιπόλοις δὲ | μοιριᾶν περὶ τιμᾶν | δηριαζομενον κτάνεν | ἐν τεμένει φιλῳ γᾶς | παρ' ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύν, which seemed to them to suggest that Neoptolemus was guilty of sacrilege. The cause of the quarrel was clearly not so well-known as to leave Pindar's expression free from doubt; and the newly discovered scholia give various explanations: ἤτοι τῶν κρεῶν ἢ διαρπαζόντων συνηθως τῶν ἄλλων ἐδυσχέρανε καὶ ἐκώλυε διὸ καὶ ἀνῃρηται ἢ τῶν χρημάτων ἃ διαρπάζων εἰς ἐκδικίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνῃρέθη. In *Nem.* 7. 42 Pindar explains that he meant the first,—ἵνα κρεῶν νιν ὕπερ μάχας | ἔλασεν ἀντιτυχόντ' ἀνὴρ μαχαίρᾳ: but the account of Eustathius, so far as it goes, suggests that in Sophocles Neoptolemus was the aggressor. (3) The subsequent birth of Tisamenus to Hermione and Orestes, and the derivation of his name. It is impossible to feel sure that these come from Sophocles: in any case, they can only have been mentioned incidentally. For the fact cf. Pausan. 2. 18. 6.

Wagner (*Epit. Vat.* p. 274 ff.) throws doubt on the account of Eustathius for quite inadequate reasons, and prefers to follow the guesses of Welcker and Ribbeck to the plain statement of our only direct authority. He treats Sophocles as the source of Apollod. *epit.* 6. 14, and would accordingly restore ὑπὸ Ὀρέστου rather than ὑπο Μαχαιρέως for the corrupt ὑπὸ Τυνδάρεω in schol. Hom. δ 4. Schwartz, on the other hand, rightly considers[1] that the *epitome* is drawn in the main from Euripides, but contains a single motive taken from the *Hermione* of Sophocles.

Vater suggested that, if fr. 872 belongs to this play, the plot may have been similar to the conclusion of Euripides' *Orestes*. But, in view of the evidence already discussed, it is clear that fr. 872 belongs elsewhere.

[1] Pauly-Wissowa I 2879.

202

ἀλλ' ὦ πατρῴας γῆς ἀγυιαίου πέδον

202 Steph. Byz. p. 22, 4 ἀγυιά· τόπος δηλῶν τὴν ἐν τῇ πόλει πορευτὴν ὁδόν... τὸ τοπικὸν ἀγυιαῖος. Σοφοκλῆς Ἑρμιόνῃ 'ἀλλ'...πέδον.' τὸ δὲ ἀγυιαῖος ὡς ἀρουραῖος.

Meineke conjectured ἀγυιαῖον, which would be in accordance with *Ai.* 859 ὦ γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον Σαλαμῖνος and Eur. fr. 558 ὦ γῆς πατρῴας χαῖρε φίλτατον πέδον. But no rigid rule can be laid down: cf. *Ai.* 135 τῆς ἀμφιρύτου Σαλαμῖνος ἔχων βάθρον ἀγχιάλου, where Bothe's ἀγχίαλον has not won acceptance. See also Elmsley on Eur. *Hclid.* 750. — L. and S. strangely connect this adjective with Apollo Ἀγυιεύς. There is no reason to doubt that it simply means 'provided with streets,' as a town settlement.

203

γνωστός

203 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 87, 25 γνωστός· ἀντὶ τοῦ γνώριμος. Σοφοκλῆς Ἑρμιόνῃ.

Nauck contends that γνωτός ought to be written as in fr. 282; but see Jebb on *O. T.* 361 and the Appendix. He also retains κλαυστά in *O.C.* 1360. The question of the origin of this intrusive σ was discussed at length by Curtius, *Greek Verb*, pp. 519—526, but his conclusions are now out of date. The form in -στος, where not phonetically justified, must be attributed to the working of analogy; γνωστός is thus necessarily later than γνωτός, although the contrary view was formerly held (Blomfield on Aesch. *Pers.* 403).

ΕΥΜΗΛΟΣ

Eumelus, as Welcker remarks (p. 66), is not a tragic hero; and nothing is known of any person bearing this name which appears suitable for the subject of a tragedy[1]. Moreover, it is only in Harpocration that the title appears; for in fr. 204 Εὐμήλῳ is an emendation for ἀμήλῳ. The best-known Eumelus is the son of Admetus and Alcestis, who actually appears in the *Alcestis* of Euripides. He commanded a contingent in the Trojan war (B 711 ff.); was famous for his horses (*ib.* 763 ff.); appeared as a competitor in the chariot race at the funeral games of Patroclus (Ψ 288 ff.), when he received something in the nature of a 'consolation' prize; and won the first prize at the games held for Achilles (Apollod. *epit.* 5. 5). Later he was one of the heroes in the wooden horse (Quint. 12. 324). Hence Meineke, concluding that he probably survived the war, referred fr. 911 to this play. Blomfield's conjecture Ἀμύκῳ for Εὐμήλῳ is improbable.

[1] Wagner's extraordinary identification of the hero of this tragedy with the Eumelus of Anton. Lib. 18, Ov. *Met.* 7. 390, requires no refutation.

204

ἀσάμινθος

204 Hesych. 1 p. 79 *αἱματώσασαι ἅρηας· αἵματος κορέσαι τὸ δόρυ. ἢ αἵματι μολῦναι καὶ χρῶσαι αὐτό· ἄση γὰρ ἡ ῥυπαρία. ὅθεν καὶ ἀσάμεθα, ἐν ᾗ τὴν ἄσην μηνύθοντε ἐνεορεῖ. Σοφοκλῆς ἀμήλῳ.*

Εὐμήλῳ was restored by Musurus; and the corruption of *ευ* to *α* is frequent in Hesychius. Blomfield conjectured Ἀμύκῳ, and Blaydes approved. The gloss has been further restored so as to read *αἵματος ἆσαι Ἄρηα...ὅθεν καὶ ἀσάμινθος, ἐν ᾗ τὴν ἄσην...μινύθοντες ἐλούοντο.* For that is the form in which the lemma and gloss occur in Suid. *s.v.*, and Bekk. *anecd.* p. 358, 31, with the addition of the words *ὅ ἐστι τὴν ῥυπαρίαν μειοῦντες* after *ἐλούοντο.* Suid. omits *τὸ δόρυ* after *κορέσαι*, and neither has *αὐτό* after *χρῶσαι*, or any trace of *ἐνεορεῖ* or of the reference to Sophocles.

A few lines below Hesychius has *αἱματῶσαι· φονεῦσαι. ἢ φοινίξαι.* Consequently, M. Schmidt conjectured that the words following *μηνύθοντε* belonged properly to this gloss, and should be emended to *ἐναρεῖν* Σ. Ε. This conjecture is supported by fr. 987. On the other hand, Schmidt is obliged to assume not merely that the words in question have been accidentally shifted, but also that they have driven out the conclusion of the clause *ἐν ᾗ κτέ.*, leaving a gap. It might be possible to account for *ἐνεορεῖ* by reading *ἐμίνυθον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι*, or even *μινύθειν ἐνεχώρει.* So R. Ellis conjectured *μινύθων τις ἀναιρεῖ.* But, for reasons already given, it can hardly be doubted that the gloss of Hesychius has been mutilated, and that it was originally identical with that of Suidas. See also Suid. *s.v. ἀσάμινθος. ἡ πύελος, ἡ σκάφη· ἐν αἷς οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐλούοντο. οὐκ ἦσαν γὰρ βαλανεῖα. παρὰ τὸ τὴν ἄσην μινύθειν.* Similarly *Etym. M.* p. 151, 52. *Etym. Gud.* p. 82, 45.

For the derivation of *ἀσάμινθος* cf. Apollon. *lex.* p. 45, 6 *ἀσάμινθος. πύελος. ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν ἄσιν μινύθειν, ὅ ἐστιν ἐλαττοῦν.* Schol. Hom. *θ* 450 *ἀσάμινθος λέγεται διὰ τὸ μινύθειν καὶ οἷον ἀφανίζειν τὴν ἄσην ἤτοι τὸν ῥύπον.* To the same effect schol. K 576.

There is no reason why Sophocles should not have introduced the Homeric *ἀσάμινθος*, although Bergk (*PLG* III 213) is hardly justified in attributing to him the words *φοιβανάτω δέ τις ἀσάμινθον* quoted without an author's name by *Etym. M.* p. 797, 7.

205

καθελών

205 Harpocr. p. 104, 18 *καθελών... ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνελὼν ἢ ἀποκτείνας. ἐχρήσαντο δὲ οὕτω τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ ἄλλοι, ὡς καὶ Στησίχορος ἐν Ἰλίου πέρσιδι* (fr. 23) *καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Εὐμήλῳ.* Phot. *lex.* p. 122, 1 *καθελών· Δημοσθένης* (23. 53) *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνελὼν ἤτοι ἀποκτείνας, καὶ Στησίχορος καὶ Σοφοκλῆς.*

The passage quoted from Demosthenes is actually from the text of a law: *ἐάν τις ἀποκτείνῃ ἐν ἄθλοις ἄκων ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ καθελών*, and no inference should be drawn from it for the usage of Attic prose. In the wider sense of *to overthrow* the examples are more numerous: v. lexx. For Sophocles cf. *Trach.* 1063 *μόνη με δὴ καθεῖλε φασγάνου δίχα. Ai.* 517 (*μοῖρα*) *καθεῖλεν Ἅιδου θανασίμους οἰκήτορας. O.C.* 1689 *κατά με φόνιος Ἀΐδας ἕλοι πατρὶ ξυνθανεῖν γεραιῷ.*

ΕΥΡΥΑΛΟΣ

The play of Sophocles is cited by Eustath. *Od.* p. 1796, 52 *κατὰ δὲ Λυσίμαχον (ἐν Νόστοις) υἱὸς αὐτῷ ἐξ Εὐίππης Θεσπρώτιδος Λεοντόφρων, ὃν ἄλλοι Δόρυκλόν φασι. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς Εὐρύαλον ἱστορεῖ, ὃν ἀπέκτεινε Τηλέμαχος.* The story of Euryalus is told by Parthenius, *narrat. am.* 3. After the slaying of the

suitors, Odysseus crossed over to Epirus on account of an oracular command; and, while hospitably entertained by Tyrimmas, became intimate with his daughter Euippe, and by her the father of a son Euryalus. When the latter had arrived at full age, his mother sent him to Ithaca, with certain tokens proving his identity. Odysseus happened to be away from home when he arrived; and Penelope, who had previously learnt something of her husband's passion for Euippe, found an opportunity to satisfy herself of the whole truth. Accordingly, when Odysseus returned, without informing him of the real position, she persuaded him that Euryalus was plotting against his life, and should be put to death. Odysseus was thus induced to slay his own child, not very long before he was himself killed by Telegonus. It will be observed that Eustathius speaks of Telemachus and not of Odysseus himself as the actual slayer. In the concluding words of Parthenius Meineke found a senarius *τρωθεὶς ἀκάνθῃ τρυγόνος θαλασσίας*, for which see the Introductory Note to the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*. Wilamowitz, *Hom. Unters.* p. 191, holds that Parthenius is an entirely untrustworthy source for the reconstruction of Sophocles' play, and that we must not accept his authority for the line recovered by Meineke, or believe that Tyrimmas was the name given by Sophocles to Euippe's father. But his scepticism has not found favour with subsequent critics: see the authorities cited by Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 625_{10}. Gruppe himself holds that the story belongs to a stratum of Thesprotian and Epirote legend which was older than the Ionian epos. Recently, Vürtheim (*Mnem.* XXIX 57) has given reasons for preferring the statement of Parthenius that Odysseus rather than Telemachus was the slayer of Euryalus: he urges that the homicide was used by Sophocles as preparatory for the *Niptra*, in order to vindicate the poetic justice of the sequel, and that Penelope's vengeance would have been incompletely executed unless the father had been induced to become the slayer of his son.

ΕΥΡΥΠΥΛΟΣ

The story of Eurypylus,—of his alliance with the Trojans, and his death in battle,—fell within the period covered by the *Little Iliad*. He was the son and successor of the Mysian Telephus, and his mother was Astyoche, the sister of Priam. Homer (λ 519 ff.), in referring to the exploits of Neoptolemus, selects as the greatest of his achievements his victory over the hero Eurypylus, the son of Telephus, who was slain, together with many of his Cetean followers, 'by reason of the gifts sent

to a woman.' The allusion implies a further knowledge of the history of Eurypylus, and is variously elucidated in the scholia. For the present purpose it is sufficient to take account of the explanation attributed to Acusilaus (*FHG* I 103). According to this, Priam, hearing of the power of Eurypylus, sent a message to him asking for his assistance. Eurypylus replied that his mother would not permit him to render it; whereupon Priam sent as a gift to Astyoche the golden vine which Zeus had given to Laomedon (or Tros[1]) as compensation for the seizure of Ganymede, and which he himself had received as an heirloom. That this version was ultimately derived from the *Little Iliad* is made almost a certainty by the mention in one of the fragments (fr. 6 K.) of the golden vine as the gift of Hephaestus to Zeus, and as subsequently passing to Laomedon as the price of Ganymede. Proclus[2] merely states that Eurypylus came to the assistance of the Trojans, and, after heroically serving their cause, was slain by Neoptolemus. Pausanias (3. 26. 9) gives the *Little Iliad* (fr. 7 K.) as his authority for the statement that Machaon was one of the Greeks who were killed by Eurypylus. Another notable victim who fell by his sword was Nireus (Hygin. *fab.* 113, Quint. 6. 372).

The arrival of Eurypylus, his entertainment by the Trojans, his departure for the field of battle, and his immediate successes are the principal subjects of the sixth book of Quintus; and these events are related in such a spirit as leaves upon the reader the impression that the fame of Eurypylus as the last hope of a losing cause (Soph. fr. 210, 76 f.) must have been widely celebrated by earlier poets whose works are now lost. It should be added that Quintus, although he mentions Astyoche (6. 136) as sister of Priam and mother of Telephus, says nothing whatever about the gift to her of the golden vine. On the other hand, it is remarkable that Strabo (615 f.) dismisses the story of Eurypylus and his Ceteans, and the allusion in the words *γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων*, as riddles in the text of Homer the solution of which is past discovery. Nevertheless, he adds, the grammarians give a supply of tales in their commentaries which are tedious rather than convincing.

Among the writings which Quintus may have utilized was the tragedy entitled *Eurypylus*, known until recently only from the catalogue given by Aristotle (*poet.* 23. 1459[b] 6), of plays

[1] In Hom. E 265 Tros is the father of Ganymede and receives the immortal horses in payment. Schol. λ 521 accordingly names Tros as recipient of the golden vine. Acusilaus is not cited for these details, but there is no doubt that Laomedon was mentioned in this connexion by the author of the *Little Iliad* (supr.). The bribe of the golden vine is in Serv. Verg. *Aen.* 1. 489 transferred to Tithonus, the father of Memnon. [2] *EGF* p. 37. Apollod. *epit.* 5. 11 adds nothing of importance.

drawn from the *Little Iliad*, and classed by Nauck (p. 838) among those of uncertain authorship. The fact that Aristotle does not name the author is no reason for refusing to attribute it to one of the great tragedians, since the Λάκαιναι of Sophocles and the Ὅπλων κρίσις of Aeschylus appear in the same list; and Tyrwhitt, in his commentary on the *poetics*, inferred from Plut. *cohib. ir.* 16 p. 463 D that the *Eurypylus* was written by Sophocles. This conjecture has now been completely confirmed by the papyrus fragments published as no. 1175 of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (IX 86 ff.). The circumstances of their discovery[1], no less than the internal evidence afforded by their contents, suffice to show that a play whose subject-matter comprised the death of Eurypylus was composed by Sophocles; and, if *Eurypylus* was not the title, at least we know of no other which could be so fitly applied to it.

The papyrus is terribly mutilated, and does not permit any conclusion to be formed in regard to the development of the plot. The only part which is continuously legible comprises a dialogue between a woman lamenting the death of a Trojan partisan and the chorus who sympathize with her. The former, who reproaches herself as justly punished by the disaster, must apparently be identified with Astyoche[2]. The dialogue is succeeded by the concluding portion of a messenger's speech, which detailed the scene enacted over the dead body of Eurypylus after the Greeks had retired, and the despair of Priam at the failure of his last hope. In the column which precedes the dialogue above referred to, only the concluding letters of each line are decipherable; but it is manifest that it originally contained the earlier narrative of the messenger, describing the duel between Neoptolemus and Eurypylus and its result. The fragment preserved by Plutarch (fr. 768 N.[2]), which we have already mentioned, portrayed the stern self-restraint of the two heroes as they advanced to the conflict, and the words χαλκέων ὅπλων, with which that fragment ended, are still legible in the papyrus. The identification, which was made by Wilamowitz, appears to be certain; for, although the remnants are insufficient in themselves to clinch the argument, the appearance of these particular

[1] See the details given by the editor at pp. 30, 86, of their relation to the papyrus containing the *Ichneutae*. It is worth remarking that Weil (*Rev. des Ét. gr.* III 343) had drawn a correct inference from Plutarch's fragment: 'Il résulte...que Sophocle traita dans une de ses tragédies le sujet qu'Aristote désigne du nom d'Εὐρύπυλος en énumérant les drames tirés de la Petite Iliade. La mère d'Eurypyle, Astyoché, cette autre Ériphyle, était sans doute un des principaux personnages de cette tragédie.'

[2] The appearance of Astyoche at Troy is consistent with the legend that she and her sisters together with others of the Trojan women were taken to Italy after the sack of the city (Tzetz. Lycophr. 921, 1075).

words at the very point where we should have expected to find Plutarch's quotation, is a coincidence too remarkable to be ignored.

The position of the remaining fragments is quite uncertain, and none of them yields any consecutive sense without the addition of hazardous restorations[1]. A few conjectures concerning their order and contents will be mentioned below, and need not be repeated here. It should, however, be stated that on the *Tabula Iliaca*, immediately before the representation of the death of Eurypylus, there is an unidentified scene in which two men stand before an altar; and it has been conjectured by Wilamowitz[2] that one of them is Eurypylus, who is promising deliverance to the Trojans. Even if he is right, it does not follow that a similar scene occurred in Sophocles, but it is highly probable that the earlier part of the play was occupied with the arrival of Eurypylus and his welcome by Priam.

The younger Philostratus (*imag.* 11) describes a painting which represented the duel of Eurypylus and Neoptolemus. The greater part of his sketch is taken up with an elaborate account of the shield of Neoptolemus, based upon the famous description in the eighteenth *Iliad*; and there is scarcely anything which can be supposed to illustrate Sophocles, unless it be the opening words (*τὰ Εὐρυπύλου καὶ Νεοπτολέμου ποιητῶν ὑμνεῖ χορὸς πατρῴζειν τε αὐτοὺς ἄμφω καὶ τὴν χεῖρα εὐδοκίμους κατ' ἰσχὺν εἶναι*).

The new papyrus, as well as that of the *Ichneutae*, is dated as belonging to the latter part of the second century.

206

. . . .

A. αι[
ἐρω[
χαλυ[νο
ἐλθόν[τ
αὐτός σ[ε 5
εἰτ[

206. 6 post *εἰτ* (quod ut εἶ[ρ]γ quoque legi potest) litterae *ων* in pap. deletae sunt

[1] In the *editio princeps* of the papyrus as many as 107 fragments were published. Most of these consist of isolated letters and parts of words belonging to three or four or occasionally more successive lines, so that, even where the restoration of a particular word is reasonably certain, it remains entirely insignificant. In such cases, and also where a complete word is legible, but that word is so common that its attribution to Sophocles has no feature of interest, I have not thought it necessary to reprint the existing vestiges. It is possible, though not, it would seem, very probable, that some of these fragments by combination with other parts of the papyrus may ultimately acquire significance; but that result would not be promoted by their reappearance in this volume. [2] *Isyllos*, p. 48₈.

B. ποία δὲ [
Σκύρου τ[
A. τοσοι[
πολ[
B. ἀλλ[
ἐμα[
A. Τ[ρ]ω[
B. . [.] . γὰ[ρ
A. λείπε[ι
B. ἐλθόντ[
A. μόνον [
B. λόγοις μ[

14—18 a prioribus discissa coniectura satis probabili huc relata

206 Wilamowitz conjectured that this and the two following fragments belonged to a dialogue between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus, which, in accordance with the usage of epic poetry, preceded their encounter. The reference to Scyros in v. 8 is thought to favour this view, but might have been made by another speaker as well as by Neoptolemus. On the other hand, there are obvious difficulties involved in the supposition that the two heroes met on the stage, since it is abundantly clear that Troy was represented as the scene of the action.

207

]υμην γένο[
Τηλέ]φου δάκνε[ι
τρ]όπον κακο[
] τί τοῦτο; ν[
]
]εγω
]ρα

207. **4** *τουτί* supra scr. pap.^{2}

207 It is uncertain whether this fragment does not rather belong to the *Ichneutae*. The variant *τουτί* (cr. n.) enhances the doubt. In v. 2 *φου* may be *φευ*, and in any case Τηλέφου is not certain.

208

. . . . . .

ΑΣ. αμε[
φήμη γὰρ α[
ΕΥ. ἐδεξάμην τ[
κόραξ ἐπᾴδ[
ΑΣ. ἄριστος, ὦ δύσ[τηνε
κράζει θυηλη[
ΕΥ. τί δ' οὖν ὁ σῶς δ[
ἔργον τί δειλο . [
ΑΣ. ἀ[λ]λ' οὔ τι μὴ συλ[
[φί]λων ἀκηδ[ὴ]ς . [
[ἀλ]λ' ἡξ[

. . . . . .

208 Murray's view, that the speakers are Eurypylus and Astyoche, is probably correct, and his restorations in vv. 3—6 are attractive: Εὐρ. *ἐδεξάμην τὸ ῥηθέν· ὡς ἄριστος ὤν | κόραξ ἐπᾴδει μάντις*...' Αστ. *ἄριστος, ὦ δύστηνε; δύσφημον μὲν οὖν | κράζει θυηλὴν Ἄρεος ὡς ὀλωλότων.* That Eurypylus protests against the arguments used to dissuade him from entering into the contest may be gathered from *ἐδεξάμην τὸ ῥηθέν, ἔργον δειλόν, κόραξ ἐπᾴδει* on the one hand, and *φήμη, κράζει, φίλων ἀκηδής* on the other.

2 φήμη: a prophetic voice. This meaning is illustrated by Blaydes on Ar. *Av.* 720. Sometimes *φήμη* in the narrower sense of an oracular utterance seems to be distinguished from *κληδών*,— a casual speech to which a warning significance is attached (Eur. *Hel.* 820 n.).

3 ἐδεξάμην: *El.* 668.

4 κόραξ. Peculiar importance was attached by diviners to the utterances of the raven, but his croak was not necessarily inauspicious. Cf. Aelian *nat. an.* 1. 48 *ταῦτά τοι καὶ μαντικοῖς συμβόλοις ἀγαθὸν ὁμολογοῦσι τὸν αὐτόν* (*sc.* *κόρακα*), *καὶ ὀττεύονταί γε πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου βοὴν οἱ συνιέντες ὀρνίθων καὶ ἕδρας καὶ κλαγγὰς καὶ πτήσεις αὐτῶν ἢ κατὰ λαιὰν χεῖρα ἢ κατὰ δεξιάν.*—**ἐπᾴδει**, *accinit*. Here apparently of an encouraging or victorious strain, as in Eur. *El.* 864.

5 f. In the conjunction of *κόραξ* with *θυηλή* Wilamowitz found an allusion to the rapacity of the raven, which would filch the offerings from the altar. Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 759, schol. Ar. *Nub.* 52 *Ἴωνοι θύοντος κόρακα ἁρπάσαι κωλῆν*. See however Murray's restoration quoted above.

9 οὔ τι μή: *O.C.* 450, *Trach.* 621.

10 ἀκηδής is an addition to the tragic vocabulary, but *ἀκηδεῖν* occurs in *Ant.* 414, Aesch. *Prom.* 524.

209

. . .

]σδ[
.[
]ησεφ[
]λη δα[
] γαῖα κ[

]ήγεθ' ὑμ[
κ]ονίας σ[
]ειναμ[
]δουστ[
]υ παρα[
]εικατη[
κ]ῆρυξ δ[
ἀγγ]έλλει μ[
]πρ[
λ[
] . [

. . .

209. **11** *τ* supra *δ* scr. pap.[2]

209 Hunt conjectured from v. 11 f. that this fragment dealt with the preliminaries of the contest.

210

Col. i. ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

]σα[ ]
]ην μεταιχ[μι]
[ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητα δ]ιαβεβλημ[ένν]

210. **1** Τη]λεφο( ) adscr. pap.[2] et infra]s **5** π]τηναι in marg. adscr. pap.[2] et infra θ]ηρασιμο( ) **8** *ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητα* ex Plutarchi loco infra allato huc revocavi (*ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητά τε* Badham: *ἐκόμπασ' ἀλοιδόρητα* codd.)

210. **8 f.** See cr. nn. Plut. *de cohib. ir.* 10 p. 458 E *καὶ τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ὁ Σοφοκλῆς καὶ τὸν Εὐρύπυλον ὀπλίσας 'ἐκόμπασ' ἀλοιδόρητα,' φησί, 'ἐρρηξάτην...ὅπλων.'* The verses are quoted by Plutarch as an instance of angry men refraining from the idle fury of words.

It is not obvious at first sight how the words taken from Plutarch can be satisfactorily combined with the vestiges of this column, although Wilamowitz identified *χ]αλκέων ὅπλων* with the conclusion of Plutarch's citation. Hunt placed *ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητά τε* after *ὅπλων*, but admitted the difficulty of joining it with the remaining traces of v. 10. Hence I was originally inclined to keep the old fragment separate from the new papyrus, relying on the fact that *χαλκᾶ ὅπλα* is not rare in tragedy (Eur. *Suppl.* 1152, *Tro.* 573, *Phoen.* 1359, *I.A.* 1260, *Hypsip.* fr. 1 col. ii 30). But this solution is excluded, when we consider that Plutarch's quotation must have come from the messenger's speech describing the duel; for that is clearly just the part of the play to which

[ἐρρηξάτην ἐς κύκλα χ]αλκέων ὅπλων
σ . [. θ]ατέρου·

9 *ἐρρηξάτην ἐς κύκλα* ex Plut. l. l. (Soph. fr. 768 N.²) huc referenda intellexit Wilamowitz (*ἐς κρίμα* Weil, fort. *ἐς σκῦλα*)

this column of the papyrus belonged. Accordingly, since τε is not an essential part of Badham's restoration (for the asyndeton cf. Eur. *Alc.* 173 ἄκλαυστος, ἀστέναστος), I have placed ἄκομπ' ἀλοιδόρητα before δ]αβεβλημ[ένοι, understanding: 'whose enmity is declared without vaunt or chiding.' διαβάλλω, which is very unsatisfactorily treated in the lexicons, is exactly our *to set by the ears*. The word does not occur in Hom. Aesch. Pind. or Bacchyl., and Herodotus is the first writer who uses it freely. In the following instances, which are confined to the passive, there is no question (I think) that διαβάλλεσθαι is simply *invisum* or *inimicum fieri*: Eur. *Hec.* 863, *Heracl.* 422 (n.), Hdt. 1. 118, 5. 35, 97, 6. 64, Thuc. 8. 81, 83. The original meaning must have been *to be placed opposite to* (*apart from*), although our evidence only applies to an opposition which has passed into *hostility*. The dative, of the person with whom the hostility has been contracted, is usually expressed; but, if ἀλλήλοις was absent from the present passage, it was easily to be supplied from the context. It is unfortunate that the idea of *speaking evil* has become so closely associated with διαβάλλω. It has nothing whatever to do with the usage now under discussion, but has led the critics astray in several instances. Thus, in Eur. *I.A.* 1372 διαβληθῇς is perfectly sound: 'take care that you don't get into trouble with the army.' Similarly, Thuc. 4. 12 should not be rendered 'lest they should lose credit.' The case might be considerably strengthened from the orators, but here it must suffice to quote one of the early instances: Andoc. 2. 24 οὐδὲν οὖν ἔτι ὑπολείπεται ὅτῳ ἂν μοι δικαίως διαβεβλῆσθε, 'there is no reason left entitling you to harbour resentment against me.' Wyttenbach's note on Plut. *mor.* 37 B still deserves attention.

So far as Plutarch's quotation is concerned, Badham's emendation brought light into darkness, but has not solved the whole riddle. '**ἐρρηξάτην** must be intransitive: "*dashed at* the orbs of (each other's) bronze shields." [L. and S. render "broke through," comparing ῥῆξαι φάλαγγα &c.: but this will not serve. Under *κύκλοι* they explain κ. χ. δ. as ="*circles of armed men*"].' (J.) The intransitive use of *ῥήγνυμι*, although in accordance with the general tendency affecting verbs of motion (fr. 941, 11, fr. 973, Eur. *Hel.* 1325 n.), is not well attested, and the best parallel is perhaps *Ai.* 775 καθ' ἡμᾶς οὗτος' ἐκρήξει μάχῃ, which Dobree was the first to explain. But it seems doubtful whether *ῥῆξαι ἐς* can signify *dash at*: it should rather mean *burst into* or *rushed forth to*, and neither of these meanings will fit *κύκλα* χ. δ. On the other hand, the circumstances seem to shew that the vv. describe the opening of the duel, and that *κύκλα ὅπλων* cannot mean 'groups of armed men.' *κύκλα*, which occurs nowhere in tragedy, if not here, is applied in Homer to a *set of wheels* (Monro, *H.G.* § 99*); and it is unlikely that Sophocles would have employed it in a non-Homeric sense. I am forced to the conclusion that *κύκλα* at any rate is corrupt. So far as the sense goes, Weil's *κρίμα* is unexceptionable, but *κρίσιν* would rather be expected, and the corruption is improbable. Still less attractive is Wecklein's *ἐρριψάτην κύβευμα*. I propose σκῦλα (ecckyla passing to eckyla), giving to *ἐς* the sense of *for* (with a view to).—**ἀλοιδόρητα** is active, like many other verbals in *-τος*: cf. χαλκόπλακτοι *El.* 484, πάνσυρτοι *ib.* 851, πιστὸν *O.C.* 1031, αὐτόγνωτοι *Ant.* 875 (with J.'s notes), and εὐλοιδόρητος, *prone to abuse*, in Plut. *amat.* 13. p. 757 A, fr. 941, 9, fr. 967, fr. 52, fr. 349. These transitive verbals are discussed by C. E. Bishop in *A.J.P.* XIII 339 ff.

H. wrote (*C.R.* XVII 288): 'The natural meaning of *κύκλα χαλκέων ὅπλων* is "round shields," as ἀσπίδος κύκλος, κύκλα προσώπου, κύκλα παρηίδων [Nonnus]. Therefore I think we are reduced to two interpretations: (1) *they broke the boasts* (*e.g.* ἀκομπαστὰ λοιδορητά) of their enemies *against their brazen shields*; or (2) *they dealt unvaunting, unreviling* blows (*e.g.* ἄκομπ', ἀλόμπαστ', ἀνεκλόμπαστ') *upon* their enemies' *round brazen shields*. In (2) there would be a play upon the phrase *ῥῆξαι* or ἀναρρῆξαι φωνήν, blows and wounds, not vaunts, were all they uttered: in *N.* 8. 28 Pindar, contrasting Ajax, the man of acts

]ἄνευ δορὸς
πα]λαίσμασιν
]ματι·
]ν πρὸς οὐραν[ὸν]
15] δ' ἐστενάζετο 15
ὀ]ργάνων στένει
π]άλλει χερὸς
]γματος φυγὼν
]ς δορὸς
20 ἔγχος] μέσον 20
]. ιται πρόσω
]υρησας κάτω
ὀμμ]άτων φάος
'Α]χιλλέως

20 ἔγχος v.l. ex alia editione depromptum adscr. pap.[2]

(ἄγλωσσον μὲν ἦτορ δ' ἄλκιμον), with Odysseus, the man of words, says of them ἦ μὰν ἀνόμοιά γε δάοισιν ἐν θερμῷ χροΐ ἔλκεα ῥῆξαν. To do that you have to break down the defence, δι' ἀσπίδος θεῖνειν Eur. *Heracl.* 685, 737, fr. 282, 20: Theocr. 22. 193 πολλὰ μὲν ἐς σάκος εὐρὺ καὶ ἱππόκομον τρυφάλειαν | Κάστωρ, πολλὰ δ' ἔνυξεν ἀκριβὴς δμμασι Λυγκεύς | τοῖο σάκος.' He also suggested ἐρραξάτην.—Herwerden conjectured μεσομφάλοις δόρη | ἐρρηξάτην κύκλοισι χ. δ., i.e. *fregerunt hastas contra clypeos.* Campbell proposed κύκλωμα (adding συννόμῳ χερί in the previous line) for ἐς κύκλα, thinking that Eurypylus and Neoptolemus met the reviling words of their enemies with blows that crashed through their shields.

H. points out that in the narrative of Quintus neither Eurypylus nor Neoptolemus refrain from arrogant boasting of their own prowess. 'In vi 384 after killing Nireus he vaunts over him, τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Εὐρύπυλος μεγάλ' εὔχετο δηωθέντι· "κεῖσό νιν, having met a better man." Then he wounds Machaon, rants in the same strain (413), καὶ εὐχόμενος μέγ' ἀύτει· "ἆ δείλ',...ὃς οὐτιδανός περ ἐὼν μέγ' ἀμείνονι φωτὶ | ἄντα κίες" κτέ., continues triumphing when he is dead, and wounds him again: in vii 479 he is repulsed by Neoptolemus and others, but vaingloriously threatens, 512—522 ὡς ἔφατ' ἀκράαντον ἰεὶς ἔπος, and these two then take the lead in fighting against one another; thus winning the congratulations of their several sides, Neoptolemus as another Achilles, Eurypylus as another Hector. In viii they meet, Eurypylus challenging, 138:

> τίς πόθεν εἰλήλουθας ἐναντίον ἄμμι μάχεσθαι;
> ἦ σε πρὸς Ἄιδα Κῆρες ἀμείλικτοι φορέουσιν·
> οὐ γάρ τίς μ' ὑπάλυξεν ἐν ἀργαλέῃ ὑσμίνῃ,
> ἀλλά μοι ὅσσοι ἔναντα λιλαιόμενοι μαχέσασθαι
> δεῦρο κίον, πάντεσσι φόνον στονόεντ' ἐφέηκα

κτέ., and there is an heroic duel, 187 τοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀπέληγον ὁμοκλῆς, | ἀλλὰ σφέας ἐδάιζον ἐς ἀσπίδας, 198 μέγα δ' ἔβραχον ἀμφοτέρωθεν | θεινόμεναι μελίῃσι τύτ' ἀσπίδες, until Neoptolemus, having gained the victory, exults over his fallen foe, hardly more modest than the other, 210 τῷ δ' ἐπικαγχαλόων μεγάλ' εὔχετο.'

11 ἄνευ δορός: fr. 941, 15.

14 πρὸς οὐρανόν, probably of cries reaching to heaven, as in Aesch. *Theb.* 429 (of Capaneus) θνητὸς ὢν ἐς οὐρανὸν | πέμπει γεγωνὰ Ζηνὶ κυμαίνοντ' ἔπη.

24 ff. The reference is to the spear of Achilles, which, as Hunt remarks, had healed Telephus, and now, in the hands of Neoptolemus, slew Eurypylus, Telephus' son. Cf. *infr.* fr. 211, 10—12.

]ους δ' ἰωμένη
Τ]ήλεφον λέγω·
]'[ἰ]άσατ[ο]·
]κ . νους ταχὺς

Col. ii. καθεῖλ' ἔσω τὰ [πλ]εῦρα[
ΑΣ. οἰοιοῖ.
διπλοῦς ἀνεστέναξ[α . . . . . .]ρα[. . . .]
ΧΟ. πατρὸ[ς . . . . . .]
ραν· ἐπ[. . . . . Πρία]μος ἴδε τέκνων.
ΑΣ. τρίτην δ' ἐπ' ἐμ[ὲ . . . . . .] ΧΟ. κ[αὶ] γὰρ οὖν
προσάγ[α]γ' ωδι[.] . ιγ[. . .]υ διαίνεις,
ἐπεὶ κτησίων φρενῶν ἐξέδυς.
ΑΣ. ὦ δαῖμον, ὦ δύσδαιμον, ὦ κείρας [ἐ]μέ.
ΧΟ. ἀγχοῦ προσεῖπας, οὐ γὰρ ἐκτὸς ἑστὼς
σύρει δὴ φύρδαν.
ΑΣ. ἐπισπάσει δίκα με.

29 οσωτα[. .]ηυρ pap.[1]: ε supra ο et ε supra η add. pap.[2] **32** sq. μοῖραν vel συμφοράν coni. Hunt **34** τριγην pap. | deest paragraphus **35** ὠδῖν' coni. Hunt, ὠδ' ἵν' vel ὦ...ὅπου Wilamowitz | δ]ακρύε[ις et infra σὺ γὰρ αὐτ[in marg. adscr. pap.[2] **39** φύρδαν ex φυρταν factum pap. φύρταν v.l. ex alia editione rettulit in marg. pap.[2]

32 πατρός: 'i.e. Telephus' (Hunt).

34 τρίτην apparently relates to διπλοῦς, but it is not clear whether Astyoche speaks of herself as successor in misfortune to Telephus and Eurypylus.—The line must be divided between the two speakers, although there is no paragraphus in the papyrus. The scribe usually allots a fresh line to a new speaker, but γὰρ οὖν must be joined to 35 f.

35 See cr. n. With Hunt's ὠδῖν', we might continue ἥνπερ εὖ διαίνεις. It is worthy of note that on Aesch. *Pers.* 1039 διαινε πῆμα schol. M comments δάκρυε τὸ ἀτύχημα.

36 'Now that thy wits have strayed from their home.' The metaphor which treats φρένες as a material possession is hardly to be rendered exactly, but there is no reason for understanding **κτησίων** (with Murray) as 'covetous,' in reference to the golden vine. We should rather compare φρένας (νοῦν) κεκτῆσθαι in Eur. *Hipp.* 701, *Or.* 1204, fr. 909. So too εὐβουλία and αὐθαδία are called **κτήματα** in *Ant.* 1050, *O.T.* 549. Observe how the metaphor is enforced by the use of words expressing local separation, when mental perturbation is described: so φρενῶν ἐκστῆναι (Eur. *Or.* 1021), ἔξεδρος (*Hipp.* 935) and many more. Add *El.* 1326 φρενῶν τητώμενος, Tr. fr. adesp. 175 τῶν φρενῶν ἐξῇρ' ἄνω.

37 δαῖμον δύσδαιμον: cf. Eur. *I. T.* 203 δυσδαίμων δαίμων, and see nn. on Eur. *Hel.* 213, *Phoen.* 1047. **δυσδαίμων** is an adj., practically equivalent to 'cruel.' For **κείρας** cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 923.

38 f. ἀγχοῦ προσεῖπας, rendered by Hunt 'thou speakest face to face,' implies rather 'thy words are near the truth.' Cf. fr. 314, 301 νῦν ἐγγὺς ἔγνως. *Ant.* 933 θανάτου τοῦτ' ἐγγυτάτω | τοῦπος ἀφῖκται. Aesch. *Theb.* 960 ἀχέων τοίων ταδ' ἐγγύθεν. Eur. *Hipp.* 1070 πρὸς ἧπαρ δακρύων τ' ἐγγὺς τόδε.—For **σύρει** cf. Plut. *de lib. educ.* 8 p. 5 F πόλεμοι χειμάρρου δίκην πάντα σύρων καὶ πάντα παραφέρων.

40 ἐπισπάσει με: 'will catch me.' The metaphor is from a fisherman hauling in his line: see on fr. 141.

ΧΟ. δίκα ναί.
ΑΣ. ἀλλ' ὡς τάχιστ' ἄριστα.
ΧΟ. ἐέ·
τί φήσομεν, τί λέξομεν;
ΑΣ. τίς οὐχὶ τοὐμὸν ἐν δίκῃ βαλεῖ κάρα;
ΧΟ. δαίμων ἔκειρεν οὐ δίκᾳ σε δαίμων.
ΑΣ. ἦ κἀμβεβᾶσι τὸν [ν]εκρὸν πρὸς τῷ κα[κ]ῷ
γέλωτ' ἔχ[ο]ντες ἀ[δρ]ὸν Ἀργεῖοι βίᾳ;
ΑΓ. οὐκ ἐς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον ὥστ' ἐπεγχαν[ε]ῖν,
ἐπεὶ πάλαισμα κοιν[ὸ]ν ἠγωνι[σ]μέν[ο]ι
ἔκειν[τ]ο νεκροὶ τυ[τ]θὸν [ἀ]λλήλων ἄ[π]ο,

41 δικᾶι pap. δικᾷ Hunt **42** ἡ ταχίστη ἀρίστη in marg. adscr. pap.[2] **46** δικᾶι pap., δικᾷ Hunt **47** κἀμβεβᾶσι scripsi: καὶ βεβᾶσι pap. **48** ἀδρὸν scripsi, αὐτὸν Wilamowitz **51** sq. δάκη τόσ' scripsi, δοκητός Hunt | cetera supplevi, nisi quod ἠκισμένος in fine v. 52 coniecerat Hunt

42 ἡ ταχίστη ἀρίστη (cr. n.) was evidently proverbial, 'the sooner the better.'

46 δίκᾳ: see cr. n. Wilamowitz assumed the existence of a present δικᾶν, so that the meaning would be 'Fortune judges thee not.' But the antithesis so presented is far from being clear, and it is simpler to accept δίκᾳ. Hunt objects that there is an inconsistency with 41, but, since δίκα is there 'punishment,' the inconsistency is at most a verbal one. The rhetorical repetition of δαίμων is Sophoclean: cf. fr. 753 (n.).

47 f. See cr. nn. The messenger's reply shows that the purpose of Astyoche's question was not to enquire whether the Argives had departed. But the chief reason for doubting the integrity of βεβᾶσι is the difficulty of combining **βίᾳ** either with it or with **γέλωτ' ἔχοντες**. The latter alternative would suggest ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα βιαζόμενοι sooner than 'laughing in another's despite.' On the other hand, ἐμβεβᾶσι...βίᾳ ('have trampled violently') is peculiarly appropriate to the context. Though a Greek might laugh at his enemy's misfortunes (*Ai.* 79), he would hesitate to spurn his corpse. Hence, in answer to Agamemnon's οὐ γὰρ θανόντι καὶ προσεμβῆναί σε χρή; Odysseus replies μὴ χαῖρ', Ἀτρείδη, κέρδεσιν τοῖς μὴ καλοῖς (*Ai.* 1348 f.). The proverbial ἐπεμβαίνειν κειμένῳ is copiously illustrated by Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 550. For the simple verb cf. Menand. *mon.* 356 μὴ 'μβαινε δυστυχοῦντι· κοινὴ γὰρ τύχη. Observe how the position of Ἀργεῖοι, recurring to the verb, justifies that of βίᾳ.—The order of the words is against the connexion of αὐτόν with τὸν νεκρόν, and it must therefore be rejected. Mekler suggests ἀμόν, but I prefer ἀδρόν, for which cf. Antiphan. fr. 144 (II 70 K.) ἀδρὸν γελάσαι 'to laugh loudly.' It is unnecessary to alter τὸν νεκρόν to τῷ νεκρῷ, for the accusative may well be governed by γέλωτ' ἔχειν after the pattern of *O.C.* 223 δέος ἴσχετε μηδὲν ὅσ' αὐδῶ (Jebb's n.) or Eur. *Or.* 1069 ἐν μομφὰν ἔχω. Observe that we must not make νεκρόν the direct object of ἔχοντες with γέλωτα as predicate: for (1) there is no evidence that γέλωτ' ἔχειν τινά could be used for γέλωτα ποιεῖσθαί (or τίθεσθαι) τινα='to make a mock of another'; (2) γέλωτ' ἔχειν should follow the analogy of αἰσχύνην ἔχειν, οἶκτον ἔχειν, ὀργὴν ἔχειν, and many other Sophoclean examples collected by Ellendt, *s.v.* ἔχω p. 293 b, thus becoming merely a substitute for γελᾶν.—For **πρὸς τῷ κακῷ**, insult added to injury, cf. Eur. fr. 1063, 15 καὶ πρὸς κακοῖσι τοῦτο δὴ μέγας γέλως.

49 ἐπεγχανεῖν. The simple verb (χανεῖν) occurs in *Ai.* 1227, but ἐγχανεῖν is exclusively comic='to put out the tongue at' (Starkie on Ar. *Vesp.* 343). Cf. fr. 314, 344.

51 τυτθόν, not elsewhere in Sophocles or Euripides. In Aeschylus the adjective occurs twice (*Ag.* 1606, fr. 337), and τυτθά as adv. in *Pers.* 367.

ὃ μὲν δ[ά]κη τόσ', ὃ δὲ [τὸ] πᾶν [ἀ]σ[χημόν]ως,
[λ]ύμην Ἀχαι[ῶν δὶς τ]όση[ν ἠκισμέ]νος.
ὡς δ' ἔκ τε πλη[γῶν κα]ὶ κό[πων κεκμηκ]ότα[ς
[αὐ]τοὺς δια[στείχοντας εἴδομεν πύλα]ς
[ἀν]ε[ί]ρομ[εν

Col. iii.
[24 litterae]ς ἰδὼν
[,, ,, ν]εκροῦ
[26 ,,]ρ[.]νη[
[25 ,,]ηχ[.]ι γ[
[26 ,,]ανηρ[
[24 ,,]ω τροφ[
[22 ,,]ν ἤματι·
[. . . . .]ω[. . . . . ἀγ]κυρῶν ἔτι
[. .]κ .[. . . . .] . ερ[. . . . . ἔ]ρρηξεν νότος.
[το]ιαῦτα πολλῶ[ν λυγρὸ]ν ἐρρ[ό]θει στόμα,
[π]ολλὴ δὲ σινδὼν [πολ]λὰ δ' Ἰστρ[ι]ανίδων

54 sqq. supplevit Wilamowitz **66** λυγρόν supplevit Wilamowitz **67** σίνδων ex σωδών factum pap.

52 Neither δοκητός nor δικητός has any probability: certainly it is difficult to see how νεκρὸς δοκητός could mean 'a dead man who seemed to be still alive.' Hunt concluded that the two corpses were those of Eurypylus and one of his victims, perhaps Nireus or Machaon; and that is the only inference open to us in the circumstances. But in that case it should be observed that δ μέν must be the Greek, and δ δέ Eurypylus, although Hunt seems to be of the contrary opinion. —For ἐάλοτ cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2. 53 φυγεῖν δάπτοι ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν, but of course there the metaphor may be taken from a sting or a bite. It is, however, a fair inference from Aesch. *Theb.* 386 λόφοι δὲ κώδων τ' οὐ δίκτυσσ' ἄνευ δορός, and *Cho.* 842 τῷ πρόσθεν ἐλκαίνοντι καὶ δεδηγμένῳ that δάπτοι could be used for a spear-wound. —The deictic use of τόσον ('just a few') is recognized by the schol. on *Trach.* 53 τοσον ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀλίγον. Cf. Hom. Σ 378 οἱ δ' ἤ τοι τόσσον μὲν ἔχον τέλος ('they were all but finished') X 322 τοῦ δ' καὶ ἄλλο τόσον μὲν ἔχεν χρόα χάλκεα τεύχεα. Dem. 34. 24 τὸ δὲ σύμπαν κεφάλαιον γίγνεται τόσον καὶ τόσον. —τὸ πᾶν is adverbial as in *El.* 1009. Rossbach suggests τὸ πᾶν ἐφθαρμένοτ.

66 τοιαῦτα. The purport of the preceding words was perhaps, 'while Eurypylus lived, our city was like a ship securely moored; but now a fierce gale has broken the cable.' Cf. Tr. fr. adesp. 379, 380. —**λυγρόν.** Hunt suggests πικρὸν as an alternative: he points out that οἰκτρόν would be too long for the gap.

67 ff. It was usual to wrap the corpse of a chieftain in fine linen. Cf. Hom. Σ 352 (of Patroclus) ἐν λεχέεσσι δὲ θέντες ἑανῷ λιτὶ κάλυψαν | ἐς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς, καθύπερθε δὲ φᾶρει λευκῷ. Ω 580 κὰδ δ' ἕλκεπον δύο φᾶρε' ἐύννητόν τε χιτῶνα, | ὄφρα νέκυν πυκάσας δοίη οἰκόνδε φέρεσθαι. β 97 Penelope is weaving a φᾶρος as Λαέρτῃ ἥρωι ταφήιον. Changes of clothing were frequently provided, either at the funeral or subsequently: Eur. *Or.* 1436, *Rhes.* 960, Thuc. 3. 58, Tac. *ann.* 3. 2. For the use of linen see Studniczka, *Beiträge*, p. 83; Hermann-Blümner, p. 363.—**Ἰστριανίδων ὕφη** were costly robes. Two successive glosses of Hesychius (II p. 374) attest that Ἰστριάνιδες and Ἰστρίδες were names given to the wrappings themselves (αἱ Σκυθικαὶ στολαὶ ἐπιθῆτές τινες οὕτω λεγόμεναι). Wilamowitz calls attention to the anachronism of introducing work from Istrian looms into the Ilion of Priam, seeing that Istros was a colony of Miletus. It should be observed that the corrector (see cr. n.) has placed a second accent over σινδών, with

ὕφη γυναικῶν ἀνδ[ρὸ]ς ἐρριπτ[ά]ζετο
. . . . . .
νεκρῷ διδόντες ο[ὐδ]ὲν ὠφελ[ο]υμένῳ.
ὃ δ' ἀμφὶ πλευραῖς καὶ σφαγαῖσι [κ]είμενος,
παπ[ὴρ] μὲν οὔ, πατρῷα δ' ἐξαυδ[ῶ]ν ἔπη,
Πρί[αμος] ἔκλαιε τὸν τέκνων ὁμ[αί]μονα,
τὸν [π]αῖδα καὶ γέροντα καὶ νεαν[ία]ν,
τὸν οὔτε Μυσὸν οὔτε Τηλέφου [κα]λῶν
ἀλλ' ὡς φυτεύσας αὐτὸς ἐκκαλούμ[εν]ος·
οἴμοι, τέκνον, προύδωκά σ' ἐσχάτη[ν ἔ]χων
Φρυξὶν μεγίστην <τ'> ἐλπίδων σωτ[ηρία]ν.
χρόνον ξενωθεὶς οὐ μακρὸν π[ολ]λῶν [καλῶν

Post v. 68 lacunam notavi **76** *προύδωκας* Wilamowitz **77** *μεγίστων* coni. Wilamowitz | *τ'* addidi **78** *καλῶν* supplevi: *ἐτῶν* et postea *δ' ἐτῶν* Wilamowitz

the intention of substituting Σίνδων (Σίνδοι was the name of a Pontic tribe) for *σινδών*. But *πολλή* shows that *σινδών* is right.—The text can hardly be defended as it stands, although Hunt supports *ἀνδρὸς ἐρριπτάζετο* in the sense of 'were cast upon the man,' and thinks that the grammatical irregularity of *διδόντες* is parallel to *Ant.* 259 f. and other similar examples. But the genitive suggests an indignity, as if the wrappings were *hurled at* Eurypylus, and the harshness of this particular anacoluthon is due to the fact that the logical subject with which *διδόντες* ought to agree is not expressed or even indicated in the two preceding lines: contrast the examples in Kuehner-Gerth § 493. *Ant.* l.c., as a case of distributive apposition, is much easier. Wilamowitz regards 69 as an interpolation; but, as this only in part removes the difficulty, I should prefer to suppose that a line has been lost after *ἐρριπτάζετο* such as *γέρας θανόντος, οἷα προσέφερον* (Eur. *Hel.* 1262) *Φρύγες*. This is better than to read *διδόντος* and understand *ἀνδρός* of Priam, as I formerly suggested, although the apparent contrast of *γυναικῶν* with *ἀνδρός* is somewhat artificial.—The thought that the dead receive no benefit from funeral offerings is a commonplace. Cf. Aesch. fr. 266. Eur. *Hel.* 1421 *τὰ τῶν θανόντων οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἄλλως πόνος. Tro.* 1248 *δοκῶ δὲ τοῖς θανοῦσι διαφέρειν βραχύ, | εἰ πλουσίων τις τεύξεται κτερισμάτων.* fr. 640 *ἀνθρώπων δὲ μαίνονται φρένες, | δαπάνας ὅταν θανοῦσι πέμπωσιν κενάς.* Verg. *Aen.* 6. 213 *cineri ingrato suprema ferebant.*

70 ff. *ὃ δ'...Πρίαμος*: Eur. *Hel.* 1025, *Phoen.* 1128.—*πλευραῖς καὶ σφαγαῖσι*, 'his wounded side,' is a fair instance of hendiadys, for which see Lobeck on *Ai.* 145. Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 247 *πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σταλαγμὸν ἐκμασεύομεν*. For *σφαγαί* in the concrete sense of 'wounds,' cf. *Rhes.* 790 *θερμὸς δὲ κρουνὸς δεσπότου παρὰ σφαγαῖς | βάλλει με.*—*πατρῷα...ἔπη* resembles *πατρῴων ὁρκίων* in *Trach.* 1223.

73 would probably have been less obscure, if we had recovered the earlier part of the play. Since *παῖδα*, in contrast with *γέροντα* and *νεανίαν*, must, as Hunt has observed, mean 'boy' rather than 'son,' we may guess that Eurypylus was represented as *βούπαιν, ἀντίπαιν*—like Achilles in fr. 564—or *ἀνδρόπαιν*—like Troilus in fr. 619, and Parthenopaeus in Aesch. *Theb.* 520. Thus, the meaning would be: 'one who, while a boy in years, was both counsellor and warrior.' Cf. Eur. fr. 508, *Parvem.* 1 436. The topic of the virtues characteristic of the various ages has recently been handled by F. M. Cornford in *Class. Q.* VI 252 ff., and it is of course possible that *παῖς* covers an allusion to *σωφροσύνη*. For *νεανίας*=*iuvenis* Wilamowitz quotes Hdt. 7. 99. Cf. fr. 314, 357 n.

75 *ἐκκαλούμενος* seems to mean 'invoking,' as contrasted with *καλῶν* in the previous line. The meaning is the same in *Trach.* 1206, where a subordinate infinitive is added: *οἷά μ' ἐκκαλεῖ, πάτερ, | φονέα γενέσθαι καὶ παλαμναῖον σέθεν.*

76 ff. See cr. n. In his smaller edition Hunt adopted Wilamowitz's *πρού-*

μνήμην παρέξεις τοῖς λ[ελειμμέν]οις Ἄ[ρεως,
ὅσ' οὔτε Μέμν[ω]ν οὔτε Σα[ρπηδών ποτε
π[έν]θη π[οήσ]α[ς κ]αίπερ αἰχ[μητῶν ἄκροι
πόλλ' ἤ[μιν . . . . .]ο[
ὡς ἐσχα[. . . . .]κ[
[ἐ]πεὶ δὲ ν[
[πο]λλοῖσι[. . . .

79 λελειμμένοις supplevit Wilamowitz, Ἄρεως Hunt **80** sq. supplevit Wilamowitz

δωκας, which requires that the full stop after σωτηρίαν should be removed and that δ' should be introduced after πολλῶν. προύδωκας, 'thou hast abandoned us' (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1454 etc.), would be good enough: but the words ἔχων ἐλπίδων σωτηρίαν are somewhat more suitable to Priam than to Eurypylus, and the clause χρόνον...μακρόν should certainly qualify μνήμην παρέξεις, whereas in the revised text it must be attached to προύδωκας... σωτηρίαν, with which it has no logical connexion. For these reasons I retain προύδωκά σ', which has the support of the papyrus, and, since *Ant.* 1166 would not justify the rendering 'I have lost you,' Priam must be supposed to reproach himself with having betrayed Eurypylus by inviting him to Troy.—**ἐλπίδων σωτηρίαν** is exactly like ἐλπίδων ἀρωγαί, which is applied to Orestes in *El.* 858. Since τε easily drops out—an error which may be illustrated from the same passage—we should probably read μεγίστην τ' here.—**καλῶν** is supported by frs. 81, 102, 592, 938.

211

ΑΣ. -μίδας καὶ τὸ[ν
Ἰδαῖον βασιλ[ῆα
Πρίαμον, ὃς μ[
πάσᾳ καταρ[
ἔπεισεν ἀβου[λίᾳ
ἔ[ργο]ν ἔρξαι. [
ΧΟ. μναμοσ[ύναν
προλι[πὼν
οὔποτ[
ΑΣ. ἰὼ δόρυ Τηλ[εφ
παιδὶ συνκῦ[ρσαν
ὦ λόγχα σώτ[ειρα
[.] ομουσαμ[
[. . . . .]ῆ[

211 The divisions between the speakers, marked by the coronis in the papyrus, are given according to Hunt's text. Wilamowitz, however, attributes the whole fragment to the chorus.

1 -μίδας is doubtless, as Wilamowitz suggested, the end of Πριαμίδαι.

4 Perhaps κατάρατον. Astyoche reproaches herself for yielding to the bribe of the golden vine.

7 ff. Hunt well suggests that these lines contained a thought similar to that of fr. 210, 78 f. Cf. fr. 212, 4.

12 σώτειρα: cf. fr. 210, 24.

212

. . . . .

]
]
]
οὐ]χὶ τεύχ[εσι
]σαι Διὸς
]. . [.]ς εὐτ[υχ]εῖ θανών·
πα]γκάλως δ' [ἀ]πώλετο
]σι θε[σ]μὸν ἰδρῦσθαι τὸ νῦ[ν
] κοινόθακα λάξοα
Τη]λέφου ξυνουσίαν
δ]εῖπνα πλησιαίτατος
]ι τῷδε, μὴ δ' ἄνω [
]τι τικτούσῃ τε[.] . [
τί]θ[η]σιν· ο[ὐ π]άρος [
] ὀρφανὴ προσηδ[
]δροπον πλόκον [
ΧΟ.]πε[. . .]ναλ-
]ειν[. . . .]αν
]νον

. . . . .

212. **6** **κοινόθακα** is a new compound, and λαξόος was hitherto known only in the active sense (Timon fr. 25 Diels). 'The allusion seems to be to the tomb of Eurypylus' (Hunt). We may perhaps further infer that the body of Eurypylus was to be buried in an ancestral rock-tomb, where Telephus already lay.

13 **δροπον** is probably the remnant of a passive compound such as *νεόδροπον*. The words seem to have described a chaplet of flowers: cf. Eur. *El.* 778 *δρέπων τερείνης μυρσίνης κάρᾳ πλόκους.*

213

. . . .

ΑΣ. . [
ἐσο[
εσσ[
ἐστ[
απα
δρᾶμ[. .]ς ἐν ἄλλο[ις
κἀγὼ φυλάξω π[
ἕως ἂν εὖ κρύψῃ[τε
ΧΟ. ἔρξω τὸ πα[

213 lacinias columnae prioris omisi

213. **8** The iota is written in the papyrus, so that, unless there was an error, *κρύψητε* was not the original.

214

. . . .

]
]υγνω[.]τ[
]υγ[.]ρε . . . μη λα[
]ω . α καὶ τρίτου[
ἀν]οίξας δεσπόταις [
εἴ]τε πένθος εἴτε τη[
]σω δὲ χρ[ό]νιον [
]λλη πημονη . [
]δη πόλλ', ε[
ι
]ερ[

. . . .

214. 5 ειτο pap.: ε supra ο add. pap.^{2} 9 ῖ supra l. add. pap.^{2}

215

. . . .

]μηδε[
] πᾶσαν εὐφρ[ον
] νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν [
Τη]λέφου κάρα λ[
νοσ]ηλεύσας ἐμὲ [
]αγμένος βω[
]ελος τ' ἐ[
]γε πάν[

. . . .

215. 5 νοσηλεύσας supplevit Wilamowitz

216

. . . .

]ρ[
]ειγ[
]ατ[. . .]σουδ[
]αρθ[. . .]οσωτ[
ψ
] βίος·

216. 5 βίῳ supra scr. pap.^{2}

] θανὼν ἅπαν [
]σεν Μυσᾷ βα[
] μέγαν δωμα[
] ἀρρυθ[μ
] καὶ παλ[
] ἥμιν· . [

7 μυσᾶι ex μυσας corr. pap.^{2}

217

. . .
]λοτη[
]ο μυρίων [
] τὸ φῶς ερ[
] μοι προσέ[
σ]υναλγουσ[
]σαισε[
. . .

217. **5** συναλγεῖν occurs in *Ai.* 253, 283.

218

. . .
]
] ἐσχαρῶν [
θ]ανὼν
]ι πότμος·
] λέγ[
]δ[
. . .

218 After this fragment several small pieces of papyrus, containing here and there a complete word in addition to other vestiges, but for the most part only portions of words, are transcribed in *Ox. Pap.* IX 101—114, and numbered frs. 16—46, 48—82, 84—90, 92, 93, 95—107. Those who desire to examine them will naturally consult the *editio princeps*. Inasmuch as they contribute nothing to our knowledge of the play, and the words which are legible are of slight interest as illustrating the vocabulary of Sophocles, it has been thought better to omit them.

219

. . . .
]πα[
]χενοσ[
]ιτ' ἀντίων [
] πρᾶξιν ἐμ[
] . ας νῦν ἀνα . [5
]ι πρᾶξις ἥδε . [
]ι Ζεὺς γὰρ ὁ[
]ν ἀλλὰ καὶ [
]ι χρῆμ' ο[
] . . [10
. . . .

219 **2** *αὐχένος* or *οὐχ ἑνός*? **3** **ἀντίων**, perhaps of *foes*, though not elsewhere so used by Soph.

220

. . .
] . [
]ντων λ . [
] ξένοι δυσήκοα [
. . .

220 **δυσήκοα**, probably in the same sense as *ἀνήκουστα* in *El.* 1407, 'terrible to hear.' The passive meaning is vouched by Pollux 2. 117 *φωνὴν...δυσήκοον*.

221

. . . . .
] . υν αν[
] βλεμμ[α
]τος γὰρ ασ[
ἀλ]λ' εἶ' ἔπειγε· [
]εῖσ . . ειν[5

221 The earlier lines seem to be trochaics, and, if that is so, the trochaics in v. 21 f. must have been placed nearer to the left margin. No certain inference can be drawn as to the situation. In v. 11 Astyoche seems to be addressed. Wilamowitz suggested that Agamemnon was waiting in the distance (v. 22) for the return of a spy who had just departed from Troy (v. 13).

4 **ἔπειγε**. For the intransitive use of the active imperative see on Eur. *Heracl.* 732, *Phoen.* 1180. Cf. Soph. *El.* 1455. Hesych. II p. 139 *ἔπειγε· κόπτου, σπεύδε.*

(B) δρ]άσω τάδ' ω[
]ας μέλαθρα ν[
(Χο.)]να κινεῖσθαι τ[
ἐν] χρόνῳ μάλι[στα
ο]ὐχ ὁρῶ· βέβηκ[ε
δ]ωμάτων ἄγχι προ[
ἀνδ]ρὸς γύναι λαγέτ[α]
φρ]οῦδός ἐσθ' ὁ ξένος
]. μ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν αἰσιωτ[ατ
]. η τέτραπται του[
]ζων ὑπ' ἄτῃ τηλ[
]α μὴ σὺν κακῷ φθε[ιρ
]ονοπληξ εὖνις ἀτι[
σ]κηπτὸς ὥρα πόνῳ
]ξ[.]η θανὼν ἄζεται κατ[
οὐδ]αμῶς ἔχοιμ' ἂν εἰπεῖν τ[
ὡς] ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀτρείδη[ς
]. σοι τηλοῦ δοκάζει τη[
]νοση βαθεια[
]ασ . . [.]πα . [

. . . . .

221. **8** κεινεισθαι pap.

18 The *ed. pr.* gave -ον ἔπληξ', but ε is said to be unsatisfactory, and the neighbourhood of εὖνις does not favour the verb. A compound with -πλήξ would be preferable, but, since ο is certain before ν, I can suggest nothing better than δαιμονοπλήξ, for which cf. δαίμονος πληγή (fr. 961 n.), Aesch. *Ag.* 1660 δαίμονος χηλῇ βαρείᾳ δυστυχῶς πεπληγμένοι.

22 ὡς supplevit Wilamowitz

20 ἄζεται is more likely than ἄζεται in a tragic text, although Hunt thinks that the latter might have been applied to a corpse exposed to the sun. [By an oversight the words are inverted in the *ed. pr.*]

23 δοκάζει, a rare word, explained by Hesych. 1 p. 526 as equivalent to μένει, ἐπιτηρεῖ, δοκεῖ, προσδοκᾷ, is quoted from Sophron fr. 52 K. πλόον δοκάζων.

222

. . . . . .

]. [. .]τα δράσε[τε
] ἀλλὰ ταῦτ' ἐγὼ . [
] εὗρον οὐδεπώποτ[ε
]ταν παῦλα καὶ κακῶν [

222 appears to contain reflections on the instability of human fortune. Wilamowitz restored ταῦτ' ἐγὼ π[άλαι | τὰ θνήτ' ἀθρήσας] εὗρον· οὐδεπώποτε | [ἡμῖν γένοι]τ' ἂν παῦλα καὶ κακῶν [λύσις | τῶν γὰρ με]γίστων ἡ τύχη μεθίσ[ταται | φρονημάτω]ν τάχιστα τοῦ λόγου [δὲ τἀν | τὸ πιστὸν ε]ἰ δείημεν, εἰ θρασὺν τ[ινα. In v. 5 Hunt thinks πλείστων more suitable than μεγίστων to the traces in the papyrus.

] . ιστων ἡ τύχη μεθίσ[ταται
]ν τάχιστα· τοῦ λόγου [
]ι δ' εἴημεν εἰ θρασὺν τ[
] τῆς τύχης ἀναστατ[
]υνημερ[. . . . .]ζετα[ι

7 εἴημεν (or *εἰδείημεν*) is clearly indicated, although the shorter forms are normal in Attic, as metre shows. But Rutherford's rigid ostracism (*New Phryn.* p. 455) of the longer forms in the plural is not justified by the evidence. The three instances in Euripides (*Cycl.* 132 *δρῴημεν*, *Hel.* 1010 *ἀδικοίημεν*, *Ion* 943 *φαίημεν*) have not been convincingly emended, and *δοίησαν* seems certain in Damoxenus fr. 2, 67 (Athen. 103 B).

8 τῆς τύχης was perhaps governed by *ἀνάστατον* (?). Cf. Tr. fr. adesp. 394 *πτωχὸν γενέσθαι καὶ δόμων ἀνάστατον*. 'Cast from his high estate.'

ΕΥΡΥΣΑΚΗΣ

Welcker (p. 197 ff.) proposed to reconstruct the plot of the *Eurysaces* from Justin 44. 3 *Gallaeci Graecam sibi originem asserunt: siquidem post finem Troiani belli Teucrum morte Aiacis fratris invisum patri Telamoni cum non reciperetur, in regnum Cyprum concessisse atque ibi urbem nomine antiquae patriae Salaminam condidisse. inde, accepta opinione paternae mortis, patriam repetisse. sed, cum ab Eurysace Aiacis filio accessu prohiberetur, Hispaniae littoribus appulsum loca ubi nunc est Carthago nova occupasse; inde Gallaeciam transisse et positis sedibus genti nomen dedisse.* It is of course unlikely that Sophocles knew of Teucer's settlement in Spain, for which Strabo (p. 157) is our earliest authority; but Welcker uses the fragments of Accius' *Eurysaces*, which was probably adapted from Sophocles, in order to fill the gaps in Justin's account. He is not however successful in establishing that the story was capable of such dramatic development as his theory requires. No answer is given to the question: why did Eurysaces refuse to receive Teucer, who rather deserved his gratitude[1]?

The fragments of Accius are in themselves so inconclusive that Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* 419 ff.) is able to give them quite a different application. According to him, Telamon in his old age had been driven out of Salamis, and was discovered by Teucer and Eurysaces living miserably in Aegina. By their help and that of the citizens he was restored to his rights.

[1] Ahrens, who accepts Welcker's view, thinks that the *ἀπολογία* of Teucer referred to in Pausan. 1. 28. 12 may have been delivered on this occasion rather than at his return from Troy. He also quotes Varro *ling. Lat.* 7. 3 *Teucer Livii post annos [illegible] suis qui sit ignoratus*, but admits that we cannot connect the statement with Sophocles.

Ribbeck's reconstruction of Accius rests upon an extremely fanciful and improbable interpretation of the famous passage in Cic. *pro Sest.* 120—123. The difficulties involved are well-known, and we do not possess the material necessary for their complete solution; but Madvig's admirable note, reproduced in Halm's edition (1845), shows the true way of escaping from the chief of them,—the apparent inconsistency of the words *in eadem fabula* (121) with the statement of the schol. Bob. that Aesopus imported a reference to contemporary politics into his performance in the *Eurysaces* of Accius. For it is certain that the quotations *o pater* and *haec omnia vidi inflammari* belong to the *Andromache* of Ennius. In view of the currency which Ribbeck's views have obtained, the following remarks may be added: (1) It is a desperate expedient to suggest that Aesopus interpolated into the *Eurysaces* a *canticum* from the *Andromache* in order to do honour to Cicero. (2) The reference to *poetae* in 123 and the quotation from the *Brutus* show that Cicero intended to recall more than one representation. (3) Since *o pater* in 121 is taken from a lament for Eetion, who was killed, it is plain that *patrem pulsum* in the following sentence applies only to the circumstances of Cicero, and not to the fate of his prototype. There is no ground therefore for inferring that the *Eurysaces* mentioned the exile *of a father*, and the reference to *Tusc.* 3. 39, which concerns the banishment of Telamon after the death of Phocus, is beside the mark. (4) The two quotations in 122 must be assigned to the *Eurysaces*, but there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that Teucer was the exile there mentioned towards whom the Greeks are charged with ingratitude. (5) There is no serious objection to Madvig's conclusion that the quotations in 120 and the beginning of 121 are taken from the *Andromache*, and refer to a Greek hero whose identity cannot be ascertained.

Pseudo-Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 1. 619 points in another direction: according to him, Teucer and Eurysaces returned from Troy in different ships; and, as Teucer arrived first without Eurysaces, Telamon, believing that his grandson was lost, refused to receive Teucer.

It is at least in favour of Welcker's view that the events which he introduces were subsequent to the withdrawal of Teucer to Cyprus. It does not seem probable that in this play Sophocles gave a different account of the home-coming of Teucer, with or without Eurysaces, from that which he made famous in the *Teucer*.

v.
than

223

ἀδόξαστον

223 Hesych. ι p. 47 ἀδόξαστον· ἀνέλπιστον. Σοφοκλῆς Εὐρυσάκει (εὐρυσά cod.). To the same effect Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 23, 8 = Bekk. *anecd.* p. 344, 28, where the name of the play is omitted (= Phryn. fr. 80 de B.).

Cf. ἄδοξα fr. 71 (n.). Later ἀδόξαστος became a philosophical word, being employed to express the certainty of knowledge as contrasted with the untrustworthiness of opinion: in this sense the Stoic wise man was ἀδόξαστος (Diog. L. 7. 162).

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ
ΕΠΙ ΤΑΙΝΑΡΩΙ ΣΑΤΥΡΟΙ
ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΣΚΟΣ

Of the eleven fragments collected under these titles three are cited from Ἡρακλῆς (with or without *σατυρικός*), two from Ἐπιταινάριοι, three from *ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ* (alone or with *σατυρικός* or *σάτυροι*), and two from Ἡρακλείσκος. I have added the solitary reference to the *Cerberus*, which, in view of the subject of the *Heracles at Taenarum*, can hardly belong to any other play. Now, Heracles was a very common character in satyr-plays, as Welcker (p. 319) showed, although it is generally believed that the *Heracles* of Euripides was the earliest treatment of his story as a subject for the tragic stage[1]. It is quite possible, therefore, that Sophocles wrote more than one satyr-play of which Heracles was the hero; and, since the proper reference of Ἡρακλείσκος is to the infant Heracles (see on Διονυσίσκος, p. 117), I agree with Wilamowitz[2] in thinking that the play known by that title did not contain the descent at Taenarum, but more probably the legend related in the twenty-fourth idyll of Theocritus and the first *Nemean* ode of Pindar. On the other hand, the prevalent opinion that the *Heracles* is to be identified with *ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ σάτυροι*—for that is the most correct of the variants—may very well be right. It is, however, more in accordance with analogy to regard Ἡρακλῆς ἢ *ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ*

[1] See Wilamowitz, Eur. *Herakles*, 1 p. 98.

[2] *Anal. Eur.* p. 39 f. So also Decharme in *Rev. Et. gr.* XII 295. F. W. Schneidewin, who first published the Anthology of Orion, held that the two plays were distinct. Arguing against this conclusion, Wagner (*Rh. Mus.* VII 149) suggested that Ἡρακλείσκῳ was an error for Ἡρακλεῖ σάκει (i.e. σατυρικῷ). For the form Ἡρακλείσκος: Ἡρακλίσκος see Lobeck, *Path. El.* 1 p. 251.

σάτυροι as alternative titles adopted by the grammarians, than (with Nauck) to speak of Ἡρακλῆς ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ σατυρικός.

Taenarum was situated at the southern point of the promontory which lay to the west of the gulf of Laconia; and a cavern close to the sea-shore was the legendary scene of the final labour of Heracles, his descent into Hades to carry off Cerberus from the under-world. This famous story was known to Homer (Θ 367, λ 623), who, however, does not mention the name Cerberus; but whether it was in the execution of this task that Heracles is said to have fought with Hades at Pylos (E 395) is by no means certain. Taenarum is mentioned as the entrance to the under-world through which Heracles descended by Eur. *Her.* 23 and Apollod. 2. 123. The incidents of the adventure are most fully described by the latter (122—126), but we have no means of connecting Sophocles with any of the particulars. It should, however, be noticed that Heracles is said to have returned by way of Troezen (Apollod. 126, Pausan. 2. 31. 2: cf. Eur. *Her.* 615)—probably in consequence of the rescue of Theseus having been effected on the same occasion. But the conditions of the satyr-play seem to require that the successful issue of the labour should be declared by the reappearance of Heracles with Cerberus[1]; and it is therefore satisfactory to find evidence of a tradition which brought him back to Taenarum (Pausan. 3. 25. 5).

From Eustath. *Il.* p. 297, 37 ἐν γοῦν τοῖς Ἡρῳδιανοῦ εἴρηται ὅτι Εἵλωτες οἱ ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ σάτυροι Nauck and Dindorf drew the inference that the chorus in this play consisted of Helots. This is an error, as has been pointed out by Décharme[2], Crusius[3], and Wecklein[4]: the intention of Herodian was to state that the satyrs described themselves as Helots, and served in that capacity, just as in the *Cyclops* they were δοῦλοι of Polyphemus, and in other plays appeared as smiths (Σφυροκόποι), reapers (Θερισταί), and acolytes (Κήρυκες). See also p. 71.

Nauck refers to the opinion of W. Hippenstiel (*de Gr. trag. princ. fab. nom.* diss. Marpurg. 1887, p. 17) that the play was produced in the last few years of Sophocles' life, but does not explain his reasons.

[1] Wagner thought that the whole action of the play was subsequent to the return of Heracles.

[2] *Rev. Ét. gr.* XII (1899) 296.

[3] *Paroemiographica*, München, 1910, p. 100.

[4] *Telephosmythus*, München, 1909, p. 6.

224

ἀλλ' οἱ θανόντες ψυχαγωγοῦνται μόνοι.

224 ἁπλοῖ codd.: corr. Rabe

224 Schol. π in Aphthon. ed. Rabe (*Rh. Mus.* LXII 570) ἐν Κερβέρῳ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἄλλως τῇ λέξει (*sc.* ψυχαγωγεῖν) ἐχρήσατο· φησὶ γάρ 'ἀλλ' οἱ (so Rabe for ἁπλοῖ codd.)...μόνοι.' ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν διαπορθμευομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Χάρωνος ψυχῶν λέγεται. The scholium on ψυχαγωγεῖν appears in a much shorter form in Doxapatres (*Rhet. Gr.* II p. 347 Walz, II p. 304 Sp.).

I have very little doubt that *Cerberus* is not the title of a play hitherto unknown, but merely an alternative name for the *Heracles ad Taenarum*, in which we know that the carrying off of Cerberus was a prominent incident. The words may have been spoken by Hermes (or Charon) in answer to a request of Heracles for guidance. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6. 391 *corpora viva nefas Stygia vectare carina.* | *nec vero Alciden me sum laetatus euntem* | *accepisse lacu.*

225

. . συνέλεγον τὰ ξύλ', ὡς ἐκκαυμάτων μή μοι μεταξὺ προσδεήσειεν

225. 1 ἐκκαύματα Pollux 10. 110

225 Pollux 10. 110 προσθετέον δὲ τῷ μαγείρῳ καὶ ξύλα καύσιμα καὶ κληματίδας καὶ ἐκκαύματα, εἰπόντος Σοφοκλέους ἐν Ἡρακλεῖ σατυρικῷ 'συνέλεγον...προσδεήσειεν.' id. 7. 110 φιτροὺς δὲ τούτους λέγει ἡ ποιητικὴ φωνή (X 29)· ἐκκαύματα δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἡρακλεῖ σατυρικῷ 'συνέλεγον τὰ ξύλ', ὡς ἐκκαυμάτων μή μοι δεήσειεν.'

Cf. *Phil.* 292 ff. εἶτ' ἔδει...ξύλων τι θραῦσαι. ἐκκαίειν τὰ πυρά occurs in Hdt. 4. 134, 135. Euripides uses ἔκκαυμα metaphorically (cf. ὑπέκκαυμα): fr. 1031 ἔκκαυμα τόλμης ἱκανόν ἐστι καὶ θράσους.— Bentley proposed προσδεεῖν εἶεν, which is no improvement. Blaydes fills up the first line with <οἱ δὲ> ξυνέλεγον.

226

τρέφουσι κρήνης φύλακα χωρίτην ὄφιν.

226 στρεφουσι codd.: corr. Jacobs | φύλλα καὶ codd.: corr. Tyrwhitt

226 Steph. Byz. p. 699, 12 χωρά... ὄφιν τὸ χωρίτης. Σοφοκλῆς Λίνῳ. καὶ ἐν Ἡρακλεῖ 'στρέφουσι ὄφιν.' Jacobs (see cr. n.) pointed out that we should read ἐν Ἡρακλεῖ σ. (*i.e.* σατυρικῷ) τρέφουσι.

For the word χωρίτης see on fr. 92, and cf. χωρίτης δράκων Aesch. fr. 123.— A serpent guarded the fountain of Ares at Thebes (Paus. 9. 10. 5): for the popular belief connecting serpents with springs see on fr. 362. We may conjecture that this fountain should be identified with the magic spring at Taenarum referred to by Paus. 3. 25. 8.

227

κυκλώπιον τροχόν

227 Hesych. II p. 550 κύκλωσι καὶ τροχοῖς· τὰ τείχη. τροχὸν δὲ τὸ τεῖχοι, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Ἡρακλεῖ (ἡρακλέα cod.) 'κυκλώπιον τροχόν.'

So we might speak of the 'circuit of the walls': cf. Shakesp. *King John* ii. 1. 259 'the roundure of your old-faced walls.' No similar instance of τροχός is

quoted from literature and τοῖχοι is now read for τροχοί in schol. Plat. *legg.* 681 A. Cf. Hesych. IV p. 181 τροχός· περιβόλαιον, τεῖχος. In *Etym. M.* p. 455, 52 θριγκῷ is explained τῷ τροχώματι, *i.e.* ὁ περιτρέχων κυκλόθεν οἷον στέφανος.—Jebb on Bacchyl. 10. 77 points out that the legend of the Cyclopes as builders is post-Homeric. So far as I have observed, only the walls of Mycenae and Tiryns are mentioned as having been erected by them, although Argos as the name of the district is sometimes introduced (Eur. *I. A.* 534). See Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 15, 945. Here it may be assumed that Mycenae is referred to, as the home of Eurystheus: cf Pind. fr. 169.

228

κρεῖσσον θεοῖς γὰρ ἢ βροτοῖς χάριν φέρειν.

228 Orion *flor.* 5. 9 p. 47, 24 ἐκ τοῦ Ἡρακλείσκου σατυρίκης. '*κρεῖσσον... φέρειν.*' Dindorf, in agreement with Wagner (p. 107_2), held that Ἡρακλείσκου here and in the source of the next fr. was a corruption of Ἡρακλέους σατυρικοῦ. The same line without the mention of author or play is quoted in *flor. Monac.* 102, with θεῷ for θεοῖς.

χάρις, a favour once conferred, becomes a debt due from the recipient: *Ai.* 522 χάρις χάριν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τίκτουσ' ἀεί, Eur. *Hel.* 1234. And the gods may be trusted to fulfil their obligations, whereas you can never be sure of a man (Aesch. fr. 399, Soph. fr. 667).—**χάριν φέρειν**, like χάριν ἔχειν, is ambiguous in itself, and may mean to *get* a boon, as in *O. T.* 764. Hence there must be some doubt as to the exact force of *O. C.* 779 ὅτ' οὐδὲν ἡ χάρις χάριν φέροι.

229

τὸν δρῶντα γάρ τι καὶ παθεῖν ὀφείλεται.

229 τῷ δρῶντι coni. Blaydes | γάρ Orion: πού schol. Pind.

229 Orion *flor.* 6. 6 p. 49, 13 ἐκ τοῦ Ἡρακλείσκου Σοφοκλέους. '*τὸν δρῶντα... ὀφείλεται.*' Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 4. 51 παρὰ τοῦτο ὁ τραγικός '*τὸν δρῶντά πού τι καὶ παθεῖν ὀφείλεται.*' Arrian *anab.* 6. 13. 5 καί τι καὶ ἰαμβεῖον ἐπεπεῖν· τὸν δὲ νοῦν εἶναι τοῦ ἰαμβείου, ὅτι τῷ τι δρῶντι καὶ παθεῖν ἐστιν ὀφειλόμενον. A very similar line is attributed to Aeschylus (fr. 456) by Stob. *ecl.* 1. 3. 24 p. 56, 22 W. and Theoph. *ad Autol.* 2. 37: δράσαντι γάρ τοι καὶ παθεῖν ὀφείλεται. It is not unlikely that the ascription to Aeschylus is due to recollection of and confusion with *Cho.* 312 δράσαντι παθεῖν, τριγέρων μῦθος τάδε φωνεῖ.

The oldest statement of the primitive *lex talionis* in Greek appears to be the line (sometimes ascribed to Hesiod) which Arist. *eth. N.* 5. 5. 1132^b 25 calls τὸ Ῥαδαμάνθυος δίκαιον: εἴ κε πάθοι τά τ' ἔρεξε δίκη κ' ἰθεῖα γένοιτο. To the passages cited above add Aesch. *Ag.* 1562 μίμνει δὲ μίμνοντος ἐν θρόνῳ Διὸς | παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα, Soph. *Ant.* 927 μὴ πλείω κακὰ | πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρῶσιν ἐκδίκως ἐμέ, Antiph. fr. 58 Diels ὅστις δὲ δράσειν μὲν οἴεται τοὺς πέλας κακῶς, πείσεσθαι δ' οὔ, οὐ σωφρονεῖ. See also fr. 962.

Blaydes has good cause for proposing τῷ δρῶντι, for which he quotes Eur. fr. 10, besides Aesch. fr. 456. He might have made his case much stronger, for the usage appears to be invariable: see *Phil.* 1421, *El.* 1173, Eur. *Alc.* 419, 782, *Andr.* 1271 f., *Or.* 1245, Lys. 25. 11. In other words, ὀφείλεται does not seem to have become impersonal, like πρέπει, προσήκει, and the rest. For the shifting usage of these verbs see Kuehner-Gerth II 27, and it is of course arguable that ὀφείλεται here may have suffered extension after their analogy.

230

τοιγὰρ ἰωδὴ φυλάξαι χοῖρον ὥστε δεσμίαν

230 χοῖρον...δεσμίαν Casaubon: χοῖρος...δεσμίων AC

230 Athen. 375 D χοῖρον δ' οἱ Ἴωνες καλοῦσι τὴν θήλειαν, ὡς Ἱππῶναξ...καὶ Σοφοκλῆς Ἐπιταιναρίοις. 'τοιγὰρ...δεσμίων.'

This fragment has not yet been successfully restored, but Casaubon's χοῖρον ὥστε δεσμίαν is made all but certain by the schol. on Ar. *Lys.* 1073, which Headlam cited: τὸ δὲ χοιροκομεῖον ἔοικε πλεκτὸν ἀγγεῖον εἶναι, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς νέους ἔτρεφον χοίρους περιδήσαντες. νῦν δὲ λέγει τὸν πάτταλον, ἐν ᾧ δεσμεύουσι τοὺς χοίρους καὶ τρέφουσιν. [The confusion in the note indicated by Rutherford does not affect the present question.] Further, most scholars have attempted to extract δεῖ from the opening words in order to provide a support for φυλάξαι, although we cannot feel sure that Athenaeus quoted a complete sentence. Casaubon edited τοιγαροῦν | ἔδει, which was adopted by Brunck in his edition of the Fragments. Dindorf gave τοιγὰρ Ἰὼ δεῖ,—an easy remedy, if it were possible to see any ground for connecting Io with this play. It is much more likely that Bergk was right in making Cerberus the object of φυλάξαι, but his reading τὸν γὰρ ἰώδη (venomous) is not altogether convincing, although the epithet might be supported by Hor. *Carm.* 3. 11. 19 *saniesque manet | ore trilingui*, and more particularly by the rationalized version of Hecataeus (*FHG* I 27) in Pausan. 3. 25. 4 ἀλλὰ Ἑκαταῖος μὲν ὁ Μιλήσιος λόγον εὗρεν εἰκότα, ὅφιν φήσας ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ τραφῆναι δεινόν, κληθῆναι δὲ Ἄιδου κύνα, ὅτι ἔδει τὸν δηχθέντα τεθνάναι παραυτίκα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰοῦ· καὶ τοῦτον ἔφη τὸν ὄφιν ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους ἀχθῆναι παρ' Εὐρυσθέα. H. conj. τῷ δεῖ φυλάξαι, ignoring τοιγάρ, which he regarded as a marginal gloss. Herwerden preferred τί γάρ; | δν δεῖ φυλάξαι, and Blaydes τοιγὰρ αὐτὴν δεῖ.

231

ἄγανον ξύλον

231 Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 12, 12 ἀγανόν· καλόν, ἡδύ. Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσισμήτῃ (v. 885) 'ἐμοὶ γὰρ αὕτη καὶ νεωτέρα δοκεῖ | πολλῷ γεγενῆσθαι κἀγανώτερον βλέπειν.' Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ ἄγανον ἔφη ξύλον βαμιτόνως τὸ κατεαγός, ἢ τὸ ἀπελέκητον. Cf. Eustath. *Il.* p. 200, 1 ἐν δὲ ῥητορικῷ Λεξικῷ (Ael. et Pausan. fr. 340 Schw.) γράφεται ταῦτα· ἄγανον· τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἡδὺ καὶ πρωϊηρές. ποτὲ δὲ κατ' ἀντίφρασιν τὸ χαλεπόν· ἐν ἑτέρῳ δέ, ὅτι ἔστι καὶ ἄγανον προπαροξυτόνως καὶ δηλοῖ τὸ κατεαγός· τραγικώτερον δέ, φησί, τὸ ὄνομα (= Cramer, *anecd. Par.* III p. 373, 32). Bekk. *anecd.* p. 335, 10 ἄγανον· τὸ κατεαγός· ἡ πρώτη ὀξεῖα, καὶ τοῦτο τραγικώτερον τὸ ὄνομα (= Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 12, 10, Phryn. fr. 48 de B.). Hesych. I p. 14 ἄγανον· τὸ κατεαγὸς ἀπὸ ἄλλου. Suid. *s.v.* ἄγανον. προπαροξυτόνως τὸ κατεαγὸς ξύλον, ἢ τὸ φρυγανῶδες καὶ ἕτοιμον πρὸς τὸ κατεαγῆναι. οἱ δὲ τὸ ἀπελέκητον.

We infer that ἄγανον was particularly employed to describe *fire-wood*, and was perhaps used substantivally like φρύγανον. Indeed, it is not quite clear whether ξύλον is quoted from Sophocles or is part of the explanation. The limitation of meaning distinguishes ἄγανος from ἐδανός, στεγανός, and πιθανός, which are all oxytone: cf. στέφανος, which was originally adjectival. For the breaking of wood to make a fire cf. *Phil.* 294 ξύλον τι θραῦσαι. Note the coincidence with fr. 235.

232

ἀλαλίαν

232 Hesych. I p. 113 ἀλαλίαν· πονηρίαν, ἀταξίαν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἐπιταιναρίοις (ἐπὶ παιενάροις cod.: corr. Casaubon). Dindorf infers that this play was called Ἐπιταιναρίοις by the grammarians, who assumed that such was the name of the satyrs. Nauck quotes Cramer, *anecd. Oxon.* I p. 59, 8 ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ Ἐπιταινάριος.

L. and S. prudently omit this mysterious word, and Ellendt's remark 'dictum quasi κακολαλία' is not very helpful. One might guess that there is some confusion with ἀλαλά (or ἀλαλαί, ἀλαλαγά?), explained as πονηρία <καὶ> ἀταξία <τοῦ λαλεῖν>. ἀλαλή was a wild tumultuous cry: cf. Pind. fr. 208 μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί τ' ὀρινομένων ῥιψαύχενι σὺν κλόνῳ, Eur. *Phoen.* 335. Now see *Etym. M.* p. 55, 48 ἀλαλή, ὁ θόρυβος καὶ ἡ ἄναρθρος φωνή...καὶ ἀλαλητός, ὁ θόρυβος, παρὰ τὴν ἀλαλήν, ἢ κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ λαλεῖν (*i.e.* inarticulate), ἢ κατ' ἐπίτασιν, οἷον ὁ πολύλαλος ὄχλος. On the other hand, ἄλαλος seems to mean *tumultuous* rather than *dumb* in Plut. *def. or.* 51 p. 438 B.

233

ἀργέμων

233 Hesych. I p. 272 ἀργέμων· τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς λευκωμάτων· οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμιῶν (ὀφθαλμῶν cod.). Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ σατυρικῷ. Cf. *Etym. M.* p. 135, 36 ἄργεμον, τὸ κατὰ πάθος γενόμενον λεύκωμα ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ· παρὰ τὸ ἀργὸν τὸ λευκόν. Erotian *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 47, 10. Eustath. *Od.* p. 1430, 60 attributes the explanation of the word to Didymus. Pollux 2. 65 has the form ἄργεμος (cf. *Etym. Gud.* p. 73, 6): ἄργεμος τὸ καλούμενον λεύκωμα, καὶ ὁ τοῦτ' ἔχων ἄνθρωπος ἐπάργεμος. It seems that ἄργεμος was the name of the disease, and ἄργεμον of the part affected; and, as Ellendt remarks, a doubt was raised to which of the two the word in Sophocles should be referred. The view taken by Didymus is to be preferred. Pollux 2. 146 says that the upper part of the nails was called ἄργεμοι. In Latin *argema* is used as a neut. sing.: see *Thesaurus s.v. Albugo* and *Leucoma* are still technical terms in modern medicine.

234

οὐ κωφεῖ

234 Phot. *lex.* p. 359, 25 οὐκ ὤφιξεν· οὐ βλάπτει. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ (τεράρωι cod.) σατύροις. The right reading was recovered from Hesych. III p. 237 οὐ κωφεῖ· οὐ βλάπτει, οὐ πηροῖ. Cf. II p. 566 κωφεῖ· κακουργεῖ, βλάπτει, κολούει (κολύει cod.), πηροῖ, with κωφητέος· βλαπτέος, and κώφησις· κόλουσις.

Wagner and M. Schmidt suggested that the error of Photius might be explained by supposing Sophocles to have written οὐ κωφεῖ ξένον (or ξένους). H. thought that the original form of the entry might have been <οὐ κωφεῖ:> οὐ κωφίζει· οὐ βλάπτει.

The original meaning of κωφός was probably 'blunt, dull,' as in Hom. Λ 390 κωφὸν γὰρ βέλος ἀνδρὸς ἀνάλκιδος οὐτιδανοῖο. Cf. *O. T.* 290 κωφὰ καὶ παλαί' ἔπη. The common use for 'deaf' or 'dumb' was a special application, but the ancient grammarians, and even Porson on Eur. *Or.* 1279, reversed the history of the word. For the wider meaning of the verb cf. Anacr. fr. 81 αἱ δέ μεν φρένες ἐκκεκωφέαται: *Etym. M.* p. 322, 22, quoting the passage, gives παραβεβλαμμέναι εἰσίν as a paraphrase.

ΗΡΙΓΟΝΗ

Besides that of Sophocles, we have a record of plays composed with this title by Phrynichus[1], Philocles, and Cleophon. Accius also wrote an *Erigona*, as we shall see. There is nothing in the three references to it in his brother's correspondence to show the character of the *Erigona* composed or translated by Q. Cicero (Cic. *Q. fr.* 3. 1, 6, 9).

Welcker (p. 215) identified this play with the *Aletes*[2] (see p. 62), on the ground that, inasmuch as Aletes and Erigone were brother and sister, the son and daughter of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra, and Orestes was the opponent of both, a divided action is not to be thought of. There is nothing in the fragments ascribed to either title which assists or hinders the identification; but, though Welcker is probably right in his view of the *Aletes*, it by no means follows that the *Erigone* refers to the same series of events.

The name of Erigone was familiar to the Athenians in connexion with the curious festival known as *αἰώρα* (for which see the commentators on Verg. *Georg.* 2. 389), at which was sung the song known as *ἀλῆτις*. Several aetiological legends arose to account for the obsolete and unintelligible titles, of which we need only refer to two.

(1) In the first of these Erigone is still the daughter of Aegisthus, but she is brought to Athens as the accuser of Orestes before the Areopagus. The most explicit account is preserved in *Etym. M.* p. 42, 3 *λέγεται γὰρ Ἠριγόνην τὴν Αἰγίσθου καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας θυγατέρα, σὺν Τυνδάρεῳ τῷ πάππῳ ἐλθεῖν Ἀθηναζε, κατηγορήσουσαν Ὀρέστου· ἀπολυθέντα (? -ος) δέ, ἀναρτήσασαν ἑαυτὴν προστρόπαιον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις γενέσθαι. κατα χρησμὸν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῇ συντελεῖσθαι τὴν ἑορτην.* To the same effect is Marm. Par. *FHG* 1 546, where Orestes is said to have been tried for the death of Aegisthus, and this no doubt accounts for the appearance of Erigone, his nearest surviving relative, as accuser. Cf. Dictys *bell. Troi.* 6. 4. In Apollod. *epit.* 6. 25 Orestes is said, according to different accounts, to have been brought to trial either by the Erinyes or by Tyndareus or by Erigone. Tyndareus doubtless appears in two of these passages as claiming retribution for the death of his daughter

[1] Probably not the pupil of Thespis: see Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 425.

[2] He assumed a double title *Ἀλήτης καὶ Ἠριγόνη* (p. 69), but the parallels which he adduces are quite uncertain.

Clytaemnestra[1]. According to others, Orestes married Erigone (Tzetz. Lycophr. 1374), and Cinaethon (fr. 4, *EGF* p. 197) mentioned Penthilus, their son.

(2) Another legend made Erigone the daughter of Icarius, by whom Dionysus was hospitably entertained, and to whom he gave a wine-skin, with instructions to spread abroad the knowledge of the newly bestowed blessing. Icarius, with his daughter Erigone and his dog Maera, came to Attica in the course of his mission, and freely bestowed his wine upon the rustics. The intoxicating results which followed convinced the shepherds that they had been poisoned, and they straightway cudgelled Icarius to death. The dog Maera by her howls guided Erigone to her father's unburied body; and Erigone, distraught with sorrow, hanged herself on a neighbouring tree. The punishment of heaven fell upon the guilty Athenians, who at length appeased the divine resentment by the institution of a festival (*αἰώρα, oscilla*) in honour of Erigone. See Hygin. *fab.* 130, Ov. *Ibis* 611 ff., Aelian *nat. an.* 7. 28, Nonn. *Dionys.* 47. 34—264. The literary sources of this story have not been traced to any earlier writer than Eratosthenes, who wrote an elegy entitled *Erigone* (E. Maass, *Anal. Eratosth.* p. 132). Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* p. 621) develops the view that the Erigone of Sophocles was the daughter of Icarius, correcting *ἐν σμηριγόνῃ* or *σμυριγόνῃ* the reading of the MSS in Erotian (fr. 236) to *ἐν σατυρικῇ Ἠριγόνῃ*. He points out that the reception of Dionysus with his chorus of satyrs by the Attic peasants offered suitable opportunities for comic episodes.

On the whole, though the evidence is insufficient to determine the contents of the *Erigone*, the balance of probability is against Welcker's identification. Against Ribbeck's view must be set the fact that the fragments of Accius' play undoubtedly relate to the story of Orestes, and he himself inclines to the identification of the *Erigona* with the *Agamemnonidae*. The frequent occurrence of the title suggests that it was suitable to a tragedy rather than to a satyr-play. Maass (*op. cit.* p. 133_{115}) adds that before Ribbeck's conjecture is approved we must satisfy ourselves that the Icarian Erigone was known as early as Sophocles[2].

[1] Wagner suggested that Tyndareus appeared in the character of the legal representative of Erigone, who could not have conducted the accusation in person owing to her juristic incapacity. On the other hand, if Aletes was adult, there was no reason for the introduction of Tyndareus into the *Aletes*, and consequently fr. 646 belonged rather to the *Erigone*.

[2] The same remark applies to Haigh's classification of the plays of Phrynichus, Philocles, and Cleophon (p. 477 ff.).

235

ἃ δὲ
δόξῃ τοπάζω, ταῦτ' ἰδεῖν σαφῶς θέλω.

235 Phot. *lex.* p. 595, 9 τοπάζειν· οἷον στοχάζεσθαι, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ὑπονοεῖν... καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἠριγόνῃ 'ἃ δὲ... θέλω.' To the same effect *Etym. M.* p. 762. 13, and Suid. *s.v.* τοπάζειν. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1368 τὸ γὰρ τοπάζειν τοῦ σάφ' εἰδέναι δίχα. Similarly Soph. *Trach.* 425 ταὐτὸ δ' οὐχὶ γίγνεται, | δόκησιν εἰπεῖν κἀξακριβῶσαι λόγον.

236

νῦν δ' εἰρὴ ὕπαφρος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἕως
ἀπώλεσέν τε καὐτὸς ἐξαπώλετο.

236. 1 ὕποφρος codd.

236 Erotian. *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 128, 16 ὕποφρον (leg. ὕπαφρον)· κρυφαῖον, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Ταραντῖνος (this refers to the authority of Heracleides of Tarentum, a distinguished medical writer belonging to the third or second century B.C., whose carefulness Galen specially commends). μαρτυρεῖ γὰρ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἠριγόνῃ (so Casaubon for σμηριγόνη: for Ribbeck's conj. see p. 174) λέγων 'νῦν δ'...ἐξαπώλετο.' μέμνηται ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ ἐν Ἰφιγενείᾳ (fr. 312). καὶ ὁ Ἱπποκράτης (*de arte* 10, VI 18 Littr.) δὲ σαφὲς ποιεῖ λέγων 'οὐθὲν ὅτι καὶ ὕποφρον (οὐχ ὕπαφρον Hippocr.) καὶ ἔχον περὶ αὐτὸ θαλάμας.' The evidence of the Mss of Hippocrates, of the lexicographers, and of Euripides and his scholia is so strong in favour of the form ὕπαφρος that we can only consider ὕποφρος to be an error in all three places of Erotian. The next question concerns the meaning of the word which was obsolete and unfamiliar in Alexandrian times. It may be remarked that the authority of Erotian stands high in itself, and is here supported by the express testimony of Heracleides: we conclude that the interpretation κρυφαῖον rests on the sound tradition of scholarly writers. As Sophocles is quoted for this meaning, some strong reason is required to justify any other interpretation. But the other evidence confirms Erotian: Phot. *lex.* p. 620, 19 and Hesych. IV p. 200 explain by ὕπουλον, κρύφιον and μὴ φανερόν (μὴ om. Phot.); and the schol. on Eur. *Rhes.* 711 has ὕπαφρος ὁ μὴ φανερός, ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὑπ' ἀφρὸν νηχομένων, ἢ τῶν ὑφάλων πετρῶν, αἷς ἐπανθεῖ ἀφρός· ἢ ὁ καταπληκτικός, ὁ μανικός. The passage in Eur. *l.c.* describes the entrance of Odysseus into Troy disguised as a beggar: ἔβα καὶ πάρος | κατὰ πόλιν ὕπαφρον ὄμμ' ἔχων | ῥακοδύτῳ στολᾷ κτέ. The following explanations have been given: (1) with the face of an idiot, (2) blear-eyed, rheumy, (3) tear-stained, (4) treacherous (or *disguised*?). The first three assume that the origin of the word is to be traced either to ἄφρων or to ἀφρός, and the only ancient evidence in their favour, apart from the scholium, is an alternative gloss in Hesychius: ὑγρασίαν ἔχον ἐμφερῆ ἀφρῷ. The balance is strongly on the side of the rendering κρυφαῖος, and there is nothing against it except that we do not know the history of the word. Whether it has anything to do with ἀφρός, meaning, as J. suggests, 'having foam beneath' (cf. ὕπουλος), must remain uncertain. The restorations proposed, νῦν δῆρις ἦν (Herwerden), νῦν δ' εἶρφ' ὕπορφνος (Ellendt), and συνῆψε δῆριν ὕπαφρον, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἕως (M. Schmidt), are not convincing. J. conjectured νῦν δ' εἶρπ' Ἄρης ὕπαφρος, 'fermenting secretly'; but what is to be made of ἐξ αὐτῶν? Perhaps νῦν δ' εἶρπε φρὴν ὕπαφρος ἐξ αὐτῶν, *i.e.* insensibly their consciousness left them. The scribe's eye passed from one ρ to the other, and the loss of ν was due to its being written above the line (Cobet, *Var. Lect.* p. 530). R. Ellis (*C. R.* IX 105) thought that ὕποφρος was a mistake for ὑπόφορος (cf. ὑποφορά—a hollow passage); but this view hardly gives sufficient weight to the evidence that ὕπαφρος existed with the meaning 'secret.' Headlam tenta-

tively suggested Ἶρις ὥς...ἐξ αὐγῶν (*C. R.* XIII 3). Blaydes: *νῦν δ' ἔρις ὕπαφρος <ἦν τις* or *ἐγένετ'> ἐξ κτέ.*

2 Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 352 *οὗ τἂν ἑλόντες αὖθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν* quotes many similar phrases for 'the biter bit.' So fr. 774. Nauck, comparing Eur. *Hel.* 106, *I. T.* 715, was inclined to substitute *ἀντ-απώλετο* for *ἐξαπώλετο. ἐξαπώλετο*, however, illustrates the Sophoclean tendency to use compounds with *ἐξ*, for which see on fr. 524, 4.

ΘΑΜΥΡΑΣ

The scene of the play was the neighbourhood of Mt Athos, as appears from fr. 237. For the connexion of Thamyras with this district cf. Eustath. *Il.* p. 299, 5 *καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῇ Ἀκτῇ τῇ περὶ τὸν Ἄθων Θάμυρις ὁ Θρᾷξ ἐβασίλευσε.* Conon 7 *εἰς τὴν Ἀκτὴν παραγενομένη τίκτει* (*sc. νύμφη*) *κοῦρον Θάμυριν ὃς ἠβήσας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἦκε κιθαρῳδίας, ὡς καὶ βασιλέα σφῶν καίπερ ἐπηλύτην ὄντα Σκύθας ποιήσασθαι.* The object of such stories was to account for the prevalence of the legend of Thamyras in various parts of the country. Strabo fr. 35 p. 331 *ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀκτῇ ταύτῃ* (*i.e.* the coast at the foot of Mt Athos) *Θάμυρις ὁ Θρᾷξ ἐβασίλευσε, τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων γεγονὼς ὢν καὶ Ὀρφεύς*[1].

In Homer, as Leaf has pointed out, Thamyras is a travelling rhapsode, and, whether by Oechalia is meant the Thessalian or the Messenian town—a point about which even the Alexandrian critics were divided (Waser in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1360)—the scene of his punishment is Dorium in Messene[2] (Strabo 350, Pausan. 4. 33. 7). See B 594—600

> *Δώριον, ἔνθα τε Μοῦσαι*
> *ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήικα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς,*
> *Οἰχαλίηθεν ἰόντα παρ' Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος·*
> *στεῦτο γὰρ εὐχόμενος νικησέμεν, εἴπερ ἂν αὐταὶ*
> *Μοῦσαι ἀείδοιεν, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο·*
> *αἱ δὲ χολωσάμεναι πηρὸν θέσαν, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὴν*
> *θεσπεσίην ἀφέλοντο καὶ ἐκλέλαθον κιθαριστύν.*

The critics are not agreed whether *πηρόν* means 'blind,' or is to be explained by the loss of the power of minstrelsy. It will also be observed that Homer does not speak of a formal contest between Thamyras and the Muses; and his account might be taken to imply nothing more than that Thamyras was

[1] Riese in *Jahrb. f. Philol.* XXIII 233 thinks the inference as to the scene of Sophocles' play doubtful.

[2] Statius follows Homer: *Theb.* 4. 181 *Getico...flebile vati | Dorion; hic fretus doctas anteire canendo | Aonidas mutos Thamyris damnatus in annos | ore simul citharaque* (*quis obvia numina temnat?*) *| conticuit praeceps.*

punished for his insolent boast[1]. In [Eur.] *Rhes.* 916—925 the Muses, coming (I suppose) from Parnassus or Pieria, have to cross the Strymon to meet the Thracian Thamyras in the neighbourhood of Mt Pangaeum :

> Φιλάμμονος παῖ, τῆς ἐμῆς ἥψω φρενός·
> ὕβρις γάρ, ἥ σ' ἔσφηλε, καὶ Μουσῶν ἔρις
> τεκεῖν μ' ἔθηκε τόνδε δύστηνον γόνον.
> περῶσα γὰρ δὴ ποταμίους διὰ ῥοὰς
> λέκτροις ἐπλάθην Στρύμονος φυταλμίοις,
> ὅτ' ἤλθομεν γῆς χρυσόβωλον ἐς λέπας
> Πάγγαιον ὀργάνοισιν ἐξησκημέναι
> Μοῦσαι μεγίστην εἰς ἔριν μελῳδίας
> κλεινῷ σοφιστῇ Θρῃκί, κἀτυφλώσαμεν
> Θάμυριν, ὃς ἡμῶν πόλλ' ἐδέννασεν τέχνην.

Euripides mentions a regular contest, and the punishment of blindness, but does not state that Thamyras was also deprived of his musical skill. There can hardly be any doubt that both punishments belonged to the Sophoclean story (cf. frs. 241, 244), as we shall see. Both are recorded by Apollod. 1. 17, who gives further particulars of the conditions of the contest : it was agreed, he says, that if Thamyras was successful, the Muses would accept him as a suitor; but that if he failed, he should lose whatever they chose. To the same effect is schol. Hom. B 595 Θρᾷξ ἐστι Φιλάμμονος υἱος· ἑαυτῷ δὲ ὥρισε τῆς μὲν ἥττης τὴν πήρωσιν πρόστιμον, τῆς δὲ νικης γάμον μιᾶς τῶν Μουσῶν. φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὸν μὲν γλαυκον ἔχειν, τὸν δὲ μέλανα. τότε δὲ τελείως τὸν ἕτερον ἀπώλεσεν. The scholiast means that Thamyras lost the black eye. Although guilty of a ludicrous confusion, the writer of this scholium derived his information from the histrionic tradition. If, therefore, the sources which he used dealt with the dramatic aspect of the story, or, in other words, with the play of Sophocles, it is perhaps legitimate to infer that the conditions which he mentions go back to the same original. The allusion of the scholiast is explained by the description of the mask of Thamyras in Pollux 4. 141 as having one grey and one black eye : cf. the use of γλαυκωμα, γλαυκότης, and γλαυκωσις in medical writers. Lessing explained the arrangement as a conventional method of depicting blindness, which was made effective by the actor turning one side or the other to the spectators as occasion required : that is to say, after

[1] Diod. 3. 67 and Pausan. 4. 33. 7 follow the Homeric account, and it is clear that both understood πηρον as = 'blind.' For other cases of blinding as the punishment of ὕβρις see Gruppe, p. 1002,. Hence, according to Plut. *de mus.* 3 p. 1132 B, Thamyras is said to have composed a poem on the war of the Titans against the gods.

the blinding of Thamyras, the actor, whose mask could not be changed, took care to present to the audience the grey eye only. He quoted Quintil. 11. 3. 74 *in comoediis...pater ille, cuius praecipuae partes sunt, quia interim concitatus interim lenis est, altero erecto altero composito est supercilio: atque id ostendere maxime latus actoribus moris est, quod cum iis quas agunt partibus congruat.*

We have no indication of the manner in which the plot was developed. This only is certain, that Thamyras passed from supreme good fortune to utter misery as the result of *ὕβρις*. One scene seems to have attained universal celebrity—that in which the wretched hero, blind and—what was even worse—deprived in his blindness of the art which might have been his solace, in anger snaps the strings of his lyre and shatters the frame; then, desolate and inconsolable, sits surrounded by the broken fragments. Such at least is a fair inference from the works of art described by Pausanias 9. 30. 2 and especially 10. 30. 8: *Θαμύριδι δὲ ἐγγὺς καθεζομένῳ τοῦ Πελία διεφθαρμέναι αἱ ὄψεις καὶ ταπεινὸν ἐς ἅπαν σχῆμά ἐστι, καὶ ἡ κόμη πολλὴ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, πολλὴ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς γενείοις· λύρα δὲ ἔρριπται πρὸς τοῖς ποσί, κατεαγότες αὐτῆς οἱ πήχεις καὶ αἱ χορδαὶ κατερρωγυῖαι.*

A circumstance in the Homeric account of Thamyras which has hardly received any attention is his connexion with Eurytus, from whose home at Oechalia Thamyras is said to have started on his way to Dorium. Now, Eurytus is the counterpart of Thamyras in another sphere: taught the use of the bow by Apollo, he challenged his master and was slain in punishment (Hom. *θ* 224 ff.). These kindred spirits are coupled by Lucian *piscat.* 6 *ἔσθ' ὅστις οὖν ταῦτα εὖ πεπονθὼς παρ' ὑμῶν κακῶς ἂν εἰπεῖν ἐπιχειρήσειεν εὐεργέτας ἄνδρας, ἀφ' ὧν εἶναί τις ἔδοξεν; ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ κατὰ τὸν Θάμυριν ἢ τὸν Εὔρυτον εἴη τὴν φύσιν ὡς ταῖς Μούσαις ἀντᾴδειν, παρ' ὧν εἴληφε τὴν ᾠδήν, ἢ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐριδαίνειν, ἐναντία τοξεύων, καὶ ταῦτα δοτῆρι ὄντι τῆς τοξικῆς.* This is probably an instance where the heroes of two similar stories have been brought into association with each other, just as Heracles and Eurytus, the rival bowmen, are for different reasons variously connected.

In Athen. 20 F and *vit. Soph.* 4 (p. 1 Blaydes) it is said that Sophocles himself played the harp at the representation of the play. It is unnecessary to adopt Welcker's view that Sophocles appeared in the character of Thamyras: in fact, the writer of the *Life* negatives this assumption by stating that Sophocles differed from the older tragedians in that he relinquished the position of an actor owing to his *μικροφωνία*.

For the votive tablet supposed to have been painted by Polygnotus for Sophocles after the production of this play see Hauser in *O. Jh.* 8. 35 ff. There is no literary evidence of its existence.

The name Thamyras belongs properly to the eponymous hero of festal gatherings (Hesych. II p. 300). In regard to its form, Θαμύρας is said to be the Attic for Θάμυρις (Cyrill. *lex.* ap. Cramer, *anecd. Par.* IV p. 183, 14), and is attested for Sophocles by the majority of our authorities. See also Adam on Plat. *rep.* 620 A.

The proverb Θάμυρις (or Ἄμυρις) *μαίνεται* applied to those whose conduct bears the aspect of folly, but is really prompted by far-seeing wisdom, has nothing to do with the minstrel (Pausan. fr. 201 Schw.).

237

Θρῇσσαν σκοπιὰν Ζηνὸς Ἀθῴου

237 Eustath. *Il.* p. 358, 40 *ὅτι δὲ Θρηικιὸς καὶ ὁ Ἄθως, οὗ μνεία παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ* (Ξ 229), *δηλοῖ, φασί, Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Θαμύρᾳ Θρῃσσαν εἰπὼν σκοπιὰν Ζηνὸς Ἀθῴου.*

In the passage of the *Iliad* which is referred to, Hera leaves Olympus, and speeds across the snowy mountain-tops of Thrace without touching the lower earth. ἐξ Ἄθω δ' ἐπὶ πόντον ἐβήσετο κυμαίνοντα. Athos is one of the Thracian heights: Hom. *h. Apoll.* 33 Θρηικίοι τ' Ἄθωες. Athos, like other high places (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1104₁), was honoured as a sanctuary of Zeus: Aesch. *Ag.* 297 Ἄθῳον αἶπος Ζηνός. Hesych. I p. 66, possibly, as Nauck thinks, with reference to this passage, has Ἄθῳος· ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἄθω τοῦ ὄρους ἱδρυμένος ἀνδριάς, ὁ Ζεύς. Mela (2. 31) speaks of the summit of Athos as always rising far above the clouds, so that the altar of Zeus remained untouched by rain. For the connexion of Thamyras with this district see Introductory Note.

238

πηκταὶ δὲ λύραι καὶ μαγάδιδες τά τ' ἐν Ἕλλησιν ξόαν' ἡδυμελῆ

238 Athen. 637 A, quoting Apollonius *ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὴν Ἀριστοκλέους ἐπιστολὴν ἀντιγραφῇ* with reference to the *μαγάδιδι*. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Θαμύρᾳ 'πηκταί . . ἡδυμελῆ.' Photius *lex.* p. 259. 15 *μαγάδις ψαλτικὸν ὄργανον. οὕτω Σοφοκλῆς.*

1 **πηκταὶ λύραι** is a periphrasis for *πηκτίδες*, for which see on frs. 241 and 412. — **μαγάδιδες**: the first syllable of this word is elsewhere short; but it appears on the whole more likely that in the case of a foreign word it might have been occasionally lengthened, than that Meineke was right in reading *μαγαδίδες*. It should, however, be noticed that though the last syllable of the acc. sing. *μάγαδιν* is short in Diogenes fr. 1, 10 (Nauck, p. 777), it appears to be long in Anacreon fr. 18 (*μαγάδην* Bergk). The material available is insufficient for the purpose of distinguishing between *πηκτὶς* and *μάγαδις*; but both belong to the class of foreign, *i.e.* oriental, stringed instruments, as

contrasted with the lyre (or *φόρμιγξ*) and the later *κιθάρα*. Both *πηκτίς* and *μάγαδις* were Lydian: see Pind. fr. 125, Telestes fr. 5. 4, Diogenes fr. 1. 6, Athen. 634 F. As such they are opposed to the native Greek instruments mentioned in the next line. They were alike also in being played by the hand without the plectrum (*χωρὶς πλήκτρου διὰ ψαλμοῦ* Aristox. ap. Athen. 635 B). Hence Hesych. III p. 61 *μαγαδίδες· ὄργανα ψαλτικά*, and Phot. *supr.*

2 ξόανα is not elsewhere applied to musical instruments, but it seems to be the intention to give a generic description of stringed instruments, which would cover both the *λύρα* and the *κιθάρα*. Ellendt refers to Hesych. III p. 171 *ξόανα· ...κυρίως δὲ τὰ ἐκ ξύλων ἐξεσμένα ἢ λίθων*. The lyre was the oldest stringed instrument and was in general use, whereas the cithara was for the most part employed by professional musicians. See Guhl and Koner, p. 201 ff.; Susemihl-Hicks on Arist. *pol.* p. 601. There was also a difference of material: the sounding-box of the lyre was made of tortoise shell, and that of the cithara with wood or metal. But it would be wrong to restrict the meaning of *ξόανα* so as to make it apply solely to the wood-work of the cithara.

239

τρίγωνος

239 Athen. 183 E *μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ τριγώνου τούτου καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν μὲν Μυσοῖς* (fr. 412) *...καὶ ἐν Θαμύρᾳ*. For the *τρίγωνος* see on fr. 412.

240

πρόποδα μέλεα τάδ' ὅσα κλέομεν
τρόχιμα βάσιμα χέρεσι πόδεσι

240. **1** *προσωδα* Ambr. | *τάδέ σε* Ambr. | *κλέομεν* Herwerden: *κλαίομεν* vel *κλύομεν* Choer., *κλαίομαι* Ambr. **2** *χερσὶ πόδεσσιν* Ambr.

240 Choeroboscus in Hephaest. *enchir.* p. 60, 17 (=217, 9 Consbr.) *τροχαῖος δέ* (*sc.* λέγεται ὁ χορεῖος), *ἐπειδὴ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τῷ Θαμύρᾳ* (Θαμύρ U, Θαμύριδι K) *φησί 'πρόποδα...πόδεσι.'* Anon. Ambros. ap. Studemund *anecd.* I p. 226, 18 *διὸ καὶ οὕτως κέκληται ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν χορῶν χορεῖος παραγωγῶς. ὁ γοῦν Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τῷ Θαμύρᾳ* (*σοφοκλῆς τὰ θάμυρα* cod.) *φησί 'πρόσωδα...πόδεσσιν.'*

1 πρόποδα has not been explained; but Campbell, who compares *προποδίζειν*, not unreasonably suggests that it may mean "'giving forwardness to the feet,' *i.e.* 'inciting to motion.'" That is to say, the strict sense is 'moving forward.' Schneidewin (*Rh. Mus.* II 297) supposed that the chorus, followers of Thamyras, are contrasting the slow processional chant of the Muses (*πρόποδα*) with the vigorous and passionate strains which they have heard (*τὰ δ' ὅσα κλύομεν*) from their master. No help is given by the gloss in Phot. Suid. *πρόποδες· μεγάλους πόδας ἔχοντες*. Nauck suggested *πρόσοδα* from the reading of the cod. Ambr., so that *πρόσοδα μέλεα* should = *προσόδια*; but there is no evidence for an adj. *πρόσοδος*, and there are other objections. —**κλέομεν** (see cr. n.) seems to provide the required sense, and *κλύουσαι* is given for *κλέουσαι* by the codd. in Eur. *I. A.* 1046. The conjecture, which occurred to me independently, has been anticipated by Herwerden, Headlam and Tucker. Herw. wrote *πρόπολε μεγάλε, τάδε σε κλέομεν*. But the break in the synaphea is objectionable: can *τάδε κλεόμενα* be right? Headlam (*C. R.* XIII 3) formerly proposed *ταυσικνάμονα*, thinking that the corruption was caused by the compound epithet,—a tendency illustrated in *C. R.* XV 17 and in his nn. on Aesch. *Ag.* 50, 1480. But the passage of Arctinus on which he relies (p. 51 K.) describes the attitude to be adopted in hurling a spear, and is not relevant; nor is the metre satisfactory. Subsequently

he seems to have changed his mind; for in *C. K.* XVI 434 n. he proposed *τὰ δ' ὅσα κλεῖομεν* or *κλεῦμεν*, or as an alternative, *κλύομεν*.

2 'With rapid movement of arms and legs.' The reference is to the rhythmical movements of the dance, in which the arms were as important as the legs. Cf. Xen. *symp.* 2. 16 *οὐδὲν ἀργὸν τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῇ ὀρχήσει ἦν, ἀλλ' ἅμα καὶ τράχηλος καὶ σκέλη καὶ χεῖρες ἐγυμνάζοντο*, and see Becker's *Charicles*, E. tr. p. 102$_{28}$.—The forms *χέρεσι* and *πόδεσι* are unique, if sound, but are related to *χέρεσσι* (Hes. *Theog.* 519) and *πόδεσσι* as *χείρεσι* to *χείρεσσι*. So the ordinary forms *μέλεσι*, *ἕπεσι* are reduced from *μέλεσσι*, *ἕπεσσι*: see Monro, *H. G.*^{2} § 102. Nauck at one time proposed to substitute *χερί τε ποδί τε*, but the traditional forms are perhaps defensible. The metre consists of resolved trochaic tetrapodies, such as are occasionally found in Euripides (*Phoen.* 1030, *Hel.* 348) and Aristophanes (*Lys.* 1279); but not, I believe, elsewhere in Sophocles.

241

ᾤχωκε γὰρ κροτητὰ πηκτίδων μέλη,
λύραι μοναύλοις τε χειμωντεως
ναος στέρημα κωμασάσης.

241. **1** *ᾤχωκε* Herwerden: *οἴχωκε* codd.

241 Athen. 175 *f* *τοῦ δὲ μοναύλου μνημονεύει Σοφοκλῆς μὲν ἐν Θαμύρᾳ οὕτως· 'ᾤχωκε ... κωμασάσης.'* Pollux 4. 75 *μοναύλου εὕρημα μέν ἐστιν Αἰγυπτίων, ᾄδονται δὲ αὐτοῦ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Θαμυριδι.*

Welcker thought that the fragment was intended to describe the supersession of the various barbaric instruments mentioned in it; but it is much more likely, as J. supposed, that it formed part of the lament of Thamyras.

1 **ᾤχωκε**: for the form see Jebb on *Ai.* 898. **κροτητά**: 'songs resounding from the harp as it is struck.' (J.) *κροτητὰ μέλη* may be taken to imply the existence of *κρούειν μέλος* in the sense of *to beat out a tune*, *i.e.* to produce a melody by striking (the harp), with *μέλος* as acc. of *result*, as[?] unlike Eur. *Ion* 168 *αἰμάσσει φόβας*. Nevertheless the phrase, though correct in itself, is made easier by the attachment of *πηκτίδων*, to which *κροτητων* might have been accommodated (hypallage). Cf. *e.g.* Seymnus 260 *σιδηροῦ τε βαστήρων κτυπος* (cited by H. in *C. K.* XVI 433). In *El.* 714 *κτύπου κροτητῶν ἁμαξῶν* is the noise of the bumping cars, as they strike against the earth. Schweighäuser on Athen. *l.c.* explains *κροτητὰ* as *sonantes palatum, hinc modulatum*, comparing *τὸ* 164 *ν μέλη πάραυλα κἀκροτητα κἀμβλα* (Tr. fr. adesp. 93), *i.e.* *gravia sonos edentia diversos atque ad modulationem*; Hesych. 1 p. 107 *κροτητα· πολυκρότητα γενόμενα. ὥστε μηδὲ συγκροτεῖσθαι μηδὲ συμπεσεῖν αὐτοῖς*. See also on fr. 463.—The *πηκτίς* was a Lydian species of harp, which is associated with the *τρίγωνον* (or *-ος*), a Phrygian triangular harp (*Dict. Ant.* II 106 b). Cf. fr. 412. (J.) Telestes fr. 5, 4 *τοὶ δ' ὀξυφώνοις πηκτίδων ψαλμοῖς κρέκων | Λύδιον ὕμνων*. It was played without the plectrum: see note on fr. 238.

2 **μοναύλοις**: the *σῦριγξ μονοκάλαμος*, or flute, as distinguished from the *σῦριγξ πολυκάλαμος*, or Pan's pipe (*Dict. Ant.* II 840 a). See also Susemihl-Hicks on Arist. *pol.* 5. 6. 1341^a 18.

The words which follow are hopelessly corrupt: 'nihil dispicio' is Kaibel's verdict. The following conjectures may be recorded: (1) Nauck: *λύρα μόναυλοί θ' οἷς ἐχαιρομεν τέως*. Campbell adds for v. 3 *στέρημ' ἀνίας <ἡδὺ> κοιμησὶ τ' ἄσῃ*. This attractive suggestion recalls fr. 314, 317. (2) Herwerden: *λύρα μόναυλοί θ' οἵδε τύχῃ, χειμὼν ὅπως | ναὸν τέρεμνα, κωμάσας' ἀνήρπασεν*; but, as J. points out, neither *τέρεμνα* nor *κωμάσας'* is satisfactory. (3) Jebb, accepting *λύρα μόναυλοί θ'*, says: 'I had thought of (1) *= ἦν γάρ οἱ = χ' οἵμην τέως. πνοὴ ἔρημον κοιμῖσας' <ἄτην>... or (2) οἵ κατίσχ' οἵμην θεὸς | πνοὴ ἔρημον κοιμίσασ'...*' (4) Blaydes thought that *ναὸς* concealed *νάβλα*: cf. fr. 849. So also Papabasileios, with *λύρας μοναύλου κἀλόμων αὐλῶν τέως* in v. 2. (5) Jacobs (ap. Schweighäuser)

conjectured *χαρμονῶν πλέως*, and for *ναος στέρημα* something like *δόνακος τέκνον* or *φύτευμα*. (6) H. wrote: 'The instrument used in the *κῶμος* was commonly the *αὐλός*: but *ναος* looks more like *δαδός*, which was also its accompaniment. There are however other possibilities, as *δαλός* or *ἀλαός*, or a compound in *-στερής*.' In *J. P.* XXXI 8 he suggested *δαδός τ' ἐρήμη πολλὰ κωμάσασα χείρ*. (7) R. Ellis: *ναούς τ' ἐρημοῖ πισσοκωνίας Ἄρης*. (8) Conington, finding *μόναυλός τε...μαντέως* in v. 2, proceeds *οἰκωμένοις (σῖς) στέρημα κωμίας ἄσης*. (9) Blaydes: *ναὸς δ' ἐρήμος οὐδὲ κῶμος ἔστ' ἔτι*. (10) G. Wolff: *λύρα μόναυλος. ποῖ τέχναι τε μαντέως | νόος τ' ἔρημα κομπάσας;* Something like *χειμὼν ὅπως | ναὸς στερήσας ἥρπασεν κωπηλάτας* might give the required sense, but the corruption is too deep to be healed without fresh evidence.

242

κοῖλον Ἄργος

242 Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 378 *πολλαχοῦ τὸ Ἄργος κοῖλόν φασι καθάπερ καὶ ἐν Ἐπιγόνοις* (fr. 190) '*τὸ κοῖλον Ἄργος οὐ κατοικήσαντ' ἔτι*' *καὶ ἐν Θαμύρᾳ* (Θαμυρίᾳ L) '*ἐκ μὲν Ἐριχθονίου ποτιμάστιον ἔσχεθε κοῦρον | Αὐτόλυκον, πολέων κτεάνων σίνιν Ἀργεϊ κοίλῳ*.' *Ὅμηρος* (δ 1) '*οἱ δ' ἔξον κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα*.'

No modern critic (with the exception of Hartung and Immisch, who thought that the verses formed part of the poetic display) has credited the statement that the two hexameter lines really belonged to the *Thamyras*. To avoid the difficulty Kirchhoff suggested the transposition of the words *Ἐπιγόνοις* and *Θαμύρᾳ*, holding that by the *Epigoni* was meant the cyclic poem bearing that title; and his solution was accepted by Nauck in his first edition, by Dindorf, by Jebb (on *O. C.* 378), and by Papageorgius in his edition of the scholia. But it has been completely refuted by Bergk for the following reasons. (1) The words *ἐν Ἐπιγόνοις* in this context ought prima facie to refer to the play of Sophocles, and it is highly improbable that, if the scholiast had intended to quote the epic, he would have introduced it in this way. (2) The line which Kirchhoff would attribute to the *Thamyras* (fr. 190) is, so far as we can tell, entirely unsuitable to that play, whereas it fits naturally with the plot of the *Epigoni*. It is probable, therefore, that if the citation of the *Thamyras* was more than a mere reference, the words quoted have dropped out of the text. Nauck takes exception to the contracted *κοῖλος* in a cyclic poem, but he should at least have referred to Hom. χ 385. We are not concerned with the hexameters, but it should be mentioned that Wilamowitz conjectured *ἐκ μὲν ἄρα χθονίου* to make them agree with the tradition that Autolycus was the son of Hermes (*ἐξ ἐριουνίου ἦ*, Weil). Others prefer to suppose that Erichthonius had a son of this name (Dümmler in Pauly-Wissowa II 2601). O. Immisch in *Jahrb. f. Philol.* Suppl. XVII 155 holds that the hexameters are correctly quoted from the play, and that they were part of the agon which must have been represented somehow or other in the course of the action. He points out that Philonis, who is the subject to *ἔσχεθε* was mother of Philammon, the father of Thamyras, as well as of Autolycus, and that this genealogy appeared as early as Hesiod (see fr. 111 Rz. *ἦ τέκεν Αὐτόλυκόν τε Φιλάμμονά τε κλυτὸν αὐδήν*). For *κοῖλον Ἄργος* see on fr. 190.

243

κάνναβις

243 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 105, 27 *κάνναβις*. *Σοφοκλῆς Θαμύρᾳ, Ἡρόδοτος τετάρτῳ*. The allusion to hemp,—probably to hempen garments,—fits the Thracian atmosphere of the play: cf. Hdt. 4. 74 *ἐξ αὐτῆς Θρῆικες μὲν καὶ εἵματα ποιεῦνται τοῖσι λινέοισιν ὁμοιότατα*, Hesych. II p. 406. Bluemner, *Technologie*, I p. 293.

244

ῥηγνὺς χρυσόδετον κέρας,
ῥηγνὺς ἁρμονίαν χορδοτόνου λύρας

244 Plut. *de cohib. ira* 5 p. 455 D ὀργιζόμεθα καὶ πολεμίοις καὶ φίλοις καὶ τέκνοις καὶ γονεῦσι καὶ θεοῖς νὴ Δία καὶ θηρίοις καὶ ἀψύχοις σκεύεσιν, ὡς ὁ Θάμυρις 'ῥηγνὺς...λύρας.' Brunck was the first who assigned the passage to Sophocles.

Pausan. 9. 30 2 mentions among statues dedicated on Mt Helicon Θάμυριν μὲν αὐτόν τε ἤδη τυφλὸν καὶ λύρας κατεαγυίας ἐφαπτόμενον.

1 **χρυσόδετον** means 'overlaid with' or 'decorated with gold,' as explained by Tucker on Aesch. *Theb.* 43. Cf. Tibull. 3. 4. 37 (of Apollo) *artis opus rarae, fulgens testudine et auro pendebat laeva gaurula parte lyra.*—**κέρας**. The statements of ancient authorities relating to the structure of the lyre are very confusing; but anyone who will refer to the illustrations figured in Guhl and Koner at p. 202 will not hesitate to understand κέρας as referring to the πήχεις or arms of the lyre, which were fixed to the sounding-board and connected by the ζυγόν. L. and S. however translate 'the bridge of the lyre,' making κέρας = μαγάδιον, a view which rests on the authority of Pollux 4. 62: see on fr. 36. Cicero also (*n.d.* 2. 144 *in fidibus testudine resonatur aut cornu*) speaks as if the sounding-board itself were made of horn, unless *cornu* is to be taken to refer to the πήχεις. Hesych. II p. 258 equates ζυγα with πήχεις, but this, if correct at all, cannot refer to the lyre.

2 Herwerden reads ῥηγνὺς δ': see on *Helid.* 491, 874, *Phoen.* 563. But for the anaphora with asyndeton H. quotes Eur. *I. T.* 1096 ποθοῦσ' Ἑλλάνων ἀγόρους, | ποθοῦσ' Ἄρτεμιν λοχίαν, fr. 839. 4 τίκτει θνητούς, | τίκτει βοτάνην φῦλά τε θηρῶν, Bacchyl. 3. 15 βρύει μὲν ἱερὰ βουθύτοις ἑορταῖς, | βρύουσι φιλοξενίαις ἀγυιαί. For the stringing of the lyre cf. Dio Chrys. 8. 4 ἐνίοτε μὲν οὖν ἐπέτεινεν αὐτόν, ἐνίοτε δὲ ἐπειρᾶτο ἀνιέναι, ὥσπερ οἱ χορδοστρόφοι τὰ νεῦρα τείνουσι, προσέχοντες μὴ ῥαγῇ. Hence ἑπτάτονος Eur. *I. T.* 1129 etc. The metre is logaoedic (aeolic), v. 1 being a glyconic, and v. 2 an asclepiad trimeter

– – ⏑ – – – – ⏑ – ⏑ –.

See J. W. White in *C. Q.* III 293, Schroeder, *Soph. cant.* p. 83.

245

μουσομανεῖ δ' ἐλάμφθην δ' ἂν καὶ τὸ ποτὶ δειράν,
ἔχομαι δ' ἔκ τε λύρας ἔκ τε νόμων
οὓς Θαμύρας
περίαλλα μουσοποιεῖ.

245. **1** ἐλαφθήν cod. Pal., ἐθάλφθην coni. Brunck, ἐμάρφθην M. Schmidt, ἐλᾷ φρήν Bernardakis | δακέτῳ Brunck **2** ἔχομαι Blaydes et H.: εὔχομαι Pal. V², ἔρχομαι rell. **3** οὓς Porson: οὐ codd. **4** περὶ ἄλλα ante Porsonum

245 Plut. *non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 11 p. 1093 D, describing the entrancing pure delight of certain intellectual studies: αἱ δ' ἀπὸ γεωμετρίας καὶ ἀστρολογίας καὶ ἁρμονικῆς, δριμὺ καὶ ποικίλον ἔχουσαι τὸ δέλεαρ, οὐδενὸς τῶν ἀγωγίμων ἀποδέουσιν, ἕλκουσαι καθάπερ ἴυγξι τοῖς διαγράμμασιν· ὧν ὁ γεωμάρτυρος, ἅνπερ ἔμπειρος ᾖ, τὰ Σοφοκλέους περίεισιν ᾄδων· 'μουσομανεῖ μουσοποιεῖ'—καὶ νὴ Δί' Εὔδοξος καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀρχιμήδης.

H., accepting δακέτῳ and reading ἔχομαι ('Fort. ἴσχομαι aut ἔχομαι' Blaydes), renders and comments as follows: "'I was <seized> in the throat by a melody-maddening snake; by the lyre I am possessed and by the strains that Thamyras makes music with surpassingly"—*aye, and not only*

Thamyras but Eudoxus and Aristarchus and Archimedes:—who, as Plutarch goes on to illustrate with well-known stories, were themselves possessed with ecstasy inspired by their discoveries in science: Archimedes, for example (1094 C), *ἐννοήσας τὴν τοῦ στεφάνου μέτρησιν οἷον ἔκ τινος κατοχῆς ἢ ἐπιπνοίας ἐξήλατο βοῶν "εὕρηκα," καὶ τοῦτο πολλάκις φθεγγόμενος ἐβάδιζεν.* The melodies of Thamyras have had an effect upon the speaker such as those of the musician Alexander had upon the Romans: he created such a *furore*, says Athenaeus (183 E), *οὕτως ἐποίησε πάντας Ῥωμαίους μουσομανεῖν ὡς τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀπομνημόνευειν αὐτοῦ τὰ κρούσματα.* Whatever the verb was, **ποτὶ δειράν** is to be constructed with it, "*I was stricken at the throat*" (the part which is the instrument of singing), as in Aesch. *Eum.* 595, where Orestes says *I slew my mother ξιφουλκῷ χειρὶ πρὸς δέρην τεμών.* The critics, except Bernardakis, who accepts *εὔχομαι* and supplies for it an inf. *ἐλᾶν* from his conjecture in the previous line (see cr. n.), reading *ἔρχομαι*, have taken *ποτὶ δειράν* with it, "*and I come to the mountain-ridge*"; and since *δειράν* in that sense has no authority, Brunck (approved by Ellendt *s.v.* *δειράς*) altered it to *ποτὶ δειράδα ἔρχομαι*: Campbell too translates "*and make my way to the ridge*," but doubts, conjecturing *ποτὶ δ' εἶραν ἔρχομαι* "*and I go to the public place.*" **ἔχομαι** is used for *κατέχομαι*, as *e.g.* ἔχω appears for *προσέχω* in *Phil.* 305. The usual phrases were *οὐ γὰρ ἐκ Μουσῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ Κορυβάντων τινῶν κατέχεσθε* Dio Chrys. I 682, *κατάσχετος ἐκ Νυμφῶν* Pausan. 10. 12. 11, *κάτοχος ἐκ Μουσῶν* Lucian II 5. Cf. Plat. *Ion* 536 A *καὶ ὁ μὲν τῶν ποιητῶν ἐξ ἄλλης Μούσης, ὁ δ' ἐξ ἄλλης ἐξήρτηται. ὀνομάζομεν δὲ αὐτὸ κατέχεται· τὸ δέ ἐστι παραπλήσιον· ἔχεται γάρ. ἐκ δὲ τούτων τῶν πρώτων δακτυλίων, τῶν ποιητῶν, ἄλλοι ἐξ ἄλλου αὖ ἠρτημένοι εἰσὶ καὶ ἐνθουσιάζουσιν, οἱ μὲν ἐξ Ὀρφέως, οἱ δὲ ἐκ Μουσαίου· οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ ἐξ Ὁμήρου κατέχονταί τε καὶ ἔχονται. ὧν σύ, ὦ Ἴων, εἷς εἶ καὶ κατέχει ἐξ Ὁμήρου.*' *ἔχομαι* is probably correct, and completes the restoration initiated by Porson (on *Med.* 284) of the latter part of the fragment. But the first line is desperately corrupt; and I cannot feel satisfied that Brunck's *δακέτῳ*, though diplomatically excellent, is suitable to the present context. It has not been observed that *μουσομανεῖ* may be a verb; and I incline to this solution, with *ποτὶ δειράν*= *towards the throat*, as in Aesch. *Ag.* 340 *οὐκέτ' ἐξ ἐλευθέρου | δέρης ἀποιμώζουσι φιλτάτων μόρον.* The sense of the intervening words, which must then contain the subject, might be given by reading *μουσομανεῖ δ' ἀναφθὲν* (or possibly even *δὲ λαμφθὲν*) *λῆμ' ἀνεκὰς ποτὶ δειράν*,—or as the accent of cod. Pal. suggests, *μουσομανεῖ δ' ἐλαφρὴν ᾆσμ' ἄνετον ποτὶ δειράν.* Herwerden conjectured in v. 1 f. *ποτὶ δ' οὐρανὸν αἴρομαι* (so also Wyttenbach) *ἔκ τε λύρας κτέ.* Wyttenbach's view that *καὶ τό* are simply the words of Plutarch linking together two quotations deserves passing mention. Mekler conjectured after *δακέτῳ, ποτὶ δ' ἰρὰν ἔρχομαι δαῖτ' ἐκ κτέ., i.e.* to the banquet of the Muses.

The metre is of the Ionic (choriambic) type, but for obvious reasons the analysis is doubtful. It should be added that H. was led partly by metrical considerations to his conjecture *ἔχομαι*. The anaclomenos *περίαλλα μουσοποιεῖ* is a common clausula in Ionics: see *e.g.* Aesch. *Suppl.* 1043.

ΘΗΣΕΥΣ

Welcker (p. 402) holds that the solitary reference to this play is an error, and that the *Phaedra* was the play intended. There is no reason why Sophocles should not have written a play entitled *Theseus*, just as Euripides did, who dramatized the Cretan adventure under that title. The evidence in its favour is very slender, and may be untrustworthy; but we ought not to refuse to credit it without some stronger reason than Welcker is able to adduce. The subject must in any case be uncertain: Welcker

records a baseless guess by Gruppe that it comprised the death of Theseus in Scyros (Plut. *Cim.* 8 etc.). If the title is an error, the most probable solution is to ascribe the quotation to the *Aegeus* (p. 15).

246

ὀμπνίου νέφους

246 Phot. *lex.* p. 342, 11 and Suid. *s.v.* ὄμπνιον (ὄπνιον Phot.) *νέφος· μέγα, πολύ, πεπληθυσμένον.* Σοφοκλῆς Θησεῖ. Suid. adds: καὶ ὄμπνιος χείρ, ἡ πλουσία, a gloss which precedes ὄμπνιον νέφος in Phot. Cf. Phot. *lex.* p. 335, 9 ὀμπνίου νέφους· μεγίστου. Hesych. III p. 206 ὀμπνείου πόνου· μεγάλου, πολλοῦ, πεπληθυσμένου. Diogen. 6. 97 ὄμπνιος χείρ. ἡ πλουσία. ὄμπνιον νέφος, μέγα, πολύ, πεπληθυσμένον.

The title Demeter ὀμπνία (schol. Nic. *Al.* 7, *CIA* III 26, 2. 3) shows the original force of the adjective (cf. *alma Ceres*); and there does not seem to be any close parallel to the Sophoclean phrase, which was preserved as a curiosity at a time when the word had become obsolete. ὄμπνιος χείρ, 'a lavish hand,' is much nearer to the original. ὄμπνιον ἔργον in Callim. fr. 183 is interpreted as *agriculture*. May it not be that the epithet was attached to *νέφος*, because the rain-cloud fertilizes the parched earth?

ΘΥΕΣΤΗΣ ΕΝ ΣΙΚΥΩΝΙ

For the possible connexion of the title *Thyestes* with the *Atreus* see p. 91. We have there pointed out that, while it is maintainable that Sophocles wrote two plays entitled *Thyestes* as well as the *Atreus*, all we can affirm with certainty is that two plays of Sophocles dealt with the banquet-story and the later history of Thyestes respectively, and that to the latter was given the title *Thyestes at Sicyon*. The chief authority now extant for the later history of the two brothers is Hygin. *fab.* 88, which by general consent is admitted to have been derived from the play of Sophocles. The confused narrative of Hyginus divides into three parts, after a reference to the turning back of the Sun's chariot in horror at the impious banquet. In the first part Thyestes is said to have fled to King Thesprotus, whose country was near lake Avernus, and thence to Sicyon where his daughter Pelopia had been placed in security. He found her sacrificing to Athena, and, fearing to pollute the sanctity of the site by his presence, hid himself in the neighbouring grove. Pelopia slipped while dancing, stained her robe with the victim's blood, and withdrew to wash it in the river. Thyestes, covering his head, rushed from the grove and violated her. Pelopia drew his sword from its scabbard, and returning to the temple hid it beneath the pedestal of the statue of the goddess. On the next day Thyestes asked the king to restore him to Lydia, his native land. There is no mention here of the oracle given to Thyestes that the

son born to him by his daughter Pelopia was destined to be the avenger of his brother's crime. This essential part of the legend appears, however, in the brief and mutilated chapter which precedes (*fab.* 87), as well as in the imperfect account of Apollodorus (*epit.* 2. 14). Cf. Lactant. on Stat. *Theb.* 1. 694 *cum responsum accepisset Thyestes aliter malorum remedium inveniri non posse, nisi cum Pelopea filia concubuisset, paruissetque responsis*, etc. The last quotation should not lead us to suppose that in the original form of the story Thyestes recognized his daughter, although the account of Hyginus is far from explicit on this point. Anyhow, so far as Sophocles is concerned, it is hardly necessary to appeal to the testimony of Aristotle (*poet.* 13. 1453ª 9—11), in order to refute such an inference being drawn concerning his version. The confusion in Hyginus between Thesprotus and the king of Sicyon becomes still more puzzling in the second division of the chapter: in consequence of a drought at Mycenae, Atreus was ordered by the oracle to bring back Thyestes. He accordingly journeyed to the court of Thesprotus, thinking that Thyestes was there, saw Pelopia, whom he believed to be the daughter of Thesprotus, and asked for her hand in marriage. Thesprotus, 'to avoid any suspicion,'—a mysterious comment—consented. But Pelopia was already pregnant by Thyestes, and exposed the child when born. The shepherds, however, gave him to a she-goat to suckle (*Aegisthus*), and Atreus had a search made for him, and brought him up as his own son. The concluding section in Hyginus is so closely compressed that it may as well be given in his own words: *interim Atreus mittit Agamemnonem et Menelaum filios ad quaerendum Thyestem: qui Delphos petierunt sciscitatum. casu Thyestes eo venerat ad sortes tollendas de ultione fratris. comprehensus ab eis ad Atreum perducitur. quem Atreus in custodiam coniici iussit Aegisthumque vocat, existimans suum filium esse, et mittit eum ad Thyestem interficiendum. Thyestes cum vidisset Aegisthum et gladium quem Aegisthus gerebat et cognovisset quem in compressione perdiderat, interrogat Aegisthum, unde illum haberet. ille respondit matrem sibi Pelopiam dedisse: quam iubet accersiri. cui respondit se in compressione nocturna nescio cui eduxisse et ex ea compressione Aegisthum concepisse. tunc Pelopia gladium arripuit simulans se agnoscere* (?) *et in pectus sibi detrusit: quem Aegisthus e pectore matris cruentum tenens ad Atreum attulit. ille existimans Thyestem interfectum laetabatur: quem Aegisthus in littore sacrificantem occidit et cum patre Thyeste in regnum avitum redit.*

Brunck inferred that the material for two plays was to be found in the chapter of Hyginus, and that the scene of the

earlier was to be placed at Sicyon, that of the later at Mycenae. Curtailed and abbreviated as the text of Hyginus obviously is, we can scarcely fail to recognize the influence of a tragedian in the concluding portion, more particularly in the *ἀναγνώρισις* and the suicide of Pelopia. But the earlier events are inconclusive, and not well suited, so far as we can judge, to dramatic representation. Agreeing, therefore, with Brunck that Sophocles' play *Θυέστης ἐν Σικυῶνι* was the ultimate source of Hyginus, I think it more likely that the earlier incidents, so far as they were material to the issue, were made known to the spectators either in the prologue or in the course of the action, and did not form the subject of a separate drama. It can hardly be doubted that fr. 247 alludes to the oracle given to Thyestes, but the words may quite well have been spoken after its prediction had been fulfilled. Rossbach (*Philol. Abhandl. M. Hertz dargebracht*, p. 253) inferred from Hygin. *fab.* 254 *Pelopia Thyestis filia in patrem* (sc. *piissima fuit*) *ut cum vindicaret* that Pelopia knew of the oracle and recognized her father, but nevertheless submitted to disgrace in order to secure his revenge. Welcker (p. 369) takes a different view, thinking that the subject of the second *Thyestes* and of the *Pelopidae* of Accius is to be found in Hygin. *fab.* 86, *Thyestes Pelopis et Hippodamiae filius quod cum Aeropa Atrei uxore concubuit a fratre Atreo de regno est eiectus. At is Atrei filium Plisthenem, quem pro suo educaverat, ad Atreum interficiendum misit: quem Atreus credens fratris filium esse imprudens filium suum occidit.* This is a pure guess, prompted by the necessity of finding a plot for the second *Thyestes*, and it is much more likely that Hygin. 86 is based on the *Plisthenes* of Euripides (*TGF* p. 556). Dindorf solves the problem by his favourite device of a second edition (see p. 4).

It should be added that the incest of Thyestes is alluded to as a tragic subject by Plat. *legg.* 838 c. See also Friedlaender on Juv. 7. 92.

247

σοφὸς γὰρ οὐδεὶς πλὴν ὃν ἂν τιμᾷ θεός.
ἀλλ' εἰς θεοὺς < σ' > ὁρῶντα, κἂν ἔξω δίκης
χωρεῖν κελεύῃ, κεῖσ' ὁδοιπορεῖν χρεών·
αἰσχρὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ὧν ὑφηγοῦνται θεοί.

247. 2 σ' add. Seyffert

247 Orion *flor.* 5. 10 (Schneidewin *com. crit.* p. 47) *ἐκ τοῦ α' Θυέστου. σοφὸς . . . θεοί.* V. 1 without the name of poet or play is also quoted in *flor. Monac.* 103.

1 Beynen conjectured *ἂν ἂν τιμᾷ θεός*, and Nauck, while condemning this as perverse, followed Meineke in the view that the line ought to be separated from the rest of the fragment, and was inserted

to think that v. 4 had no connexion with vv. 2, 3. Similarly F. W. Schmidt (*Krit. Stud.* I 254), who rewrites the passage in order to avoid the supposed incompatibility of ἔξω δίκης with αἰσχρὸν οὐδέν. But all the lines appear to be part of an answer to an objection (of Thyestes?) that, if the oracle pointed to incest, its injunction must be disregarded: see Introductory Note. The reply is that such considerations cannot be allowed, since human wisdom is of no avail unless it is *blessed by heaven*. The attitude towards σοφία is similar to that of Eur. *Bacch.* 200 ff. and other passages in the same play; in Sophocles it does not surprise us. For θεὸς τιμᾷ cf. Aesch fr. 302, *Theb.* 703, Eur. *Her.* 1338 θεοὶ δ' ὅταν τιμῶσιν οὐδὲν δεῖ φίλων. F. W. Schmidt adds Hes. *Theog.* 81, Theogn. 169.

2 ff. These lines have been cleared up by Wecklein's proposal to insert σ' and treat κελεύῃ as second pers. sing. of the pass. subjunctive. The same suggestion was made independently by Tucker (*C. R.* XVII 190) and by Blaydes, who, however, inclined to εἰς θεόν σ' ὀρᾶν τε κτέ. The insertion of σ' appears to have been proposed first by Seyffert (*Rh. Mus.* XV 615), but he wished to substitute θεόν for θεούς, in order to provide κελεύῃ with a subject. It is natural to compare the passage with Euripides' famous line (fr. 292, 7) εἰ θεοί τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρόν, οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί, and the contrast is significant of the attitude of the two poets towards morality and religion. Sophocles is serenely confident that no reconciliation of their claims is necessary; if morality seems to conflict with the will of the gods, so much the worse for it. But for Euripides, if the gods seem to enjoin an immoral action, they become untrue to their nature and are no longer trustworthy. See Nestle's article on *Sophokles und die Sophistik* in *Class. Philol.* V 129 ff. The present lines would accurately describe the position of Orestes in the *Electra*, who has no hesitation in obeying the command of Apollo, even though it involves matricide: see v. 1424 τὰν δόμοισι μὲν | καλῶς, Ἀπόλλων εἰ καλῶς ἐθέσπισεν, and Jebb's Introd. p. xli.—ὁδοιπορεῖν is used 10 times by Sophocles, but not at all by Aeschylus or Euripides. For ἔξω δίκης cf. Eur. *Andr.* 786, *Bacch.* 1010 τὰ δ' ἔξω νόμιμα | δίκας ἐκβαλόντα τιμᾶν θεούς. The context here limits δίκη to the sphere of established or conventional morality. The conception of δίκη as a human institution was as old as Hesiod (*Op.* 279): cf. Plat. *Prot.* 322 c. The word is so applied in accordance with its original meaning of *custom* or *order*, for which see F. M. Cornford, *From Religion to Philosophy*, p. 172 ff.—For the acc. after ὑφηγεῖσθαι, involved in the attracted ὧν ('where the gods take the lead, prompt') cf. Lys. 33. 3 ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὖν ταῦθ' ὑφηγήσατο,—such was the lead given by Heracles.

248

ἀποπλήκτῳ ποδί

248 Hesych. I p. 254 ἀποπλήκτῳ ποδί· μανιώδει. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ Σικυωνίῳ.

For the word cf. *Phil.* 731 τί δή... σιωπᾷς κἀπόπληκτος ὧδ' ἔχει; *Ant.* 1189 κἀποπλήσσομαι, *i.e.* 'I faint away.' Dem. 21. 143 οὐχ οὕτως εἶμ' ἄφρων οὐδ' ἀπόπληκτος ἐγώ. 34. 16 οὕτως ἀπόπληκτον καὶ παντελῶς μαινόμενον. There is a similar transference of the adjective in *O. T.* 479 μελέῳ ποδί, *ibid.* 877 ποδὶ χρησίμῳ, Eur. *Phoen.* 834 τυφλῷ ποδί, Aesch. *Eum.* 545 ἀθέῳ ποδί, Tr. fr. adesp. 227 λαιθάργῳ ποδί. See also on fr. 790.

249

ἀμόρφωτον

249 Hesych. I p. 151 ἀμόρφωτον· ἀδιατύπωτον. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ τῷ ἐν Σικυῶνι. Cf. Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 94, 15 ἀμόρφωτος· ἀδιόρθωτος, ἄπλαστος, ἀσχημάτιστος.

ἀμόρφωτος, *formless*, reappears as an epithet of ὕλη in the pseudo-Pythagorean treatise published under the name of Timaeus Locrus, 94 A (vulg. ἄμορφον). It is not a genuine verbal,—for we

may leave out of account the scholiastic *ἀμορφώω*,—but an amplified substitute for *ἄμορφος* such as the tragedians were prone to coin. Similar instances are *ἀφυβήτος O. T.* 885 beside *ἄφυβος*, *ἀπάρβητος Ai.* 197 beside *ἀπάρβής*, *χρυσολόλητος* Eur. *Phoen.* 2 beside *χρυσόκολλος*, *καλλιπύργωτος Bacch.* 19 beside *καλλίπυργος*, *ἀμαρτύρητος Her.* 290 beside *ἀμάρτυρος*, *ἀφύλλωτος* fr. 299 beside *ἄφυλλος*. See the excellent note of Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* l.c., and further on fr. 1014.

250

αὐτόμοιρος

250 *αὐτόμοιρος* Casaubon : *αὐτόμαρος* cod.

250 Hesych. I p. 327 *αὐτόμοιρος (αὐτόμαρος* cod.)· *μονόμοιρος. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ Σικυωνίῳ (Θυέστη σικυωνία* cod. : corr. Musurus). The traditional interpretation, followed by Liddell and Scott, *with special destiny*, is almost nonsense. Following the analogy of *δίμοιρος*, we should conclude that *μονόμοιρος* as applied to a person means 'having a single share.' 'Sharing alone' is an illogical but emphatic term to express sole possession (oxymoron): cf. the use of *μονομερής*. *αὐτοπάμων*, if that word is really the source of the Hesychian *αὐτόπομα· ἐπίκληρον*, would be the nearest parallel.

251

αὐτόφορτοι

251 Hesych. I p. 329 *αὐτόφορτοι· αὐτοδιάκονοι, κυρίως δὲ οἱ ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις πλοίοις. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ Σικυωνίῳ (Θυέστη σικυωνία* cod. : corr. Musurus). *ὁ δὲ Κρατῖνος ἐν Χείρωνι* (fr. 248, I 88 K.) *τοὺς τὰ κοινὰ φορτιζομένους ἔφη.*

αὐτόφορτος is properly and strictly applied to the *ναύκληρος* who voyages with his own cargo on board his own ship, as contrasted on the one hand with the seaman who carried for hire, and on the other with the merchant who ventured his goods in another's bottom. In Aesch. *Cho.* 671 *στείχοντα δ' αὐτόφορτον οἰκείᾳ σαγῇ* the speaker describes himself as a travelling merchant, contrasted with a carrier. Cratinus, however, seems to have used the word for those who embezzled public monies. Such at least is Meineke's view which Kock adopts; but the latter thinks that the word *κοινοφόρτους* may have fallen out before *ἔφη*.

252

ἐπαίνους

252 Hesych. II p. 132 *ἐπαίνους· τὰς αἱρέσεις καὶ τὰς συμβουλίας καὶ τὰς ἀρχαιρεσίας* (*ἀρχεσίας* cod.). *Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ Σικυωνίῳ. καὶ ἀλλοῖοι ταῖς ἐπαινητασιν* (sic cod.).

The explanatory words 'decisions, recommendations, and elections (*i.e.* support of a particular individual)' may be taken to refer to the approval of an assembly which voted and elected its officers by acclamation. Such was the Spartan *ἀπελλα*: Thuc. I. 87 *κρίνουσι γὰρ βοῇ καὶ οὐ ψήφῳ*. See further Greenidge, *Handbook of Greek constitutional antiquities*, p. 100. In this respect no doubt Sparta adhered to the procedure of the heroic age: cf. Hom. Γ 461 *ὣς ἔφαν' Ἀτρεΐδῃ, ἐπὶ δ' ἤνεον ἄλλοι Ἀχαιοί*, Eur. *Hclid.* 811 *στρατὸν δ' ἐπήνεσ(εν)*, *Or.* 901 *ἐπερρόθησαν δ' οἱ μὲν ὡς καλῶς λέγοι, | οἱ δ' οὐκ ἐπήνουν*. The concluding words were no doubt rightly referred to Alcaeus (fr. 128) by Maussac and Voss. Nauck substitutes *τοῖς* for *ταῖς* without comment, and it certainly seems probable that Alcaeus used *ἑταιρίτης* of a political supporter, rather than that *ταῖς ἑταιρίταισιν* is correct. Bergk's alternative suggestions that Sophocles wrote *δὲ ἀλλάθοι τοῖς ἑταιρίταισιν* or *τοῖς ἑταιρίταισιν* alone are very unlikely.

253

ἀφωσιωμέναι

253 Hesych. I p. 338 *ἀφοσιωμέναι· ἀνόσιαι, ἄποθεν τοῦ ὁσίου γεγενημέναι. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ β'.* Cf. *ibid.* p. 341 *ἀφωσιωμένε· ἄποθεν τοῦ ὁσίου ἀφωρισμένε.*

The important word *ἀφοσιοῦν*, more common in the middle, cannot be fully treated here. The meaning attested by Hesych. arises from the double sense of dedication, seen in such words as *devotus*, *sacer*, *ἅγος*, which has been well compared by Miss Harrison (*Prolegomena*, pp. 59, 108) with the condition of the savage *tabu*. Thus *ἀφοσιοῦν*, to separate from the *ὅσια*, is to make an *ἅγος* or *tabu*; and a *φαρμακός* would properly be described as *ἀφωσιωμένος*. Cf. Hipponax fr. 11 *ὡς οἱ μὲν ἄγει Βουπάλῳ κατηρῶντο*. In this sense *ἀφοσιοῦν* is equivalent to *ἐναγίζειν*, and is contrasted with *ἀφαγνίζειν*, to remove from the *tabu* or to disenchant, for which cf. Eur. *Alc.* 1144, and *ἀφιεροῦν*, which has the same meaning in Aesch. *Eum.* 454 (of Orestes, as *ἀφαγνίζειν* in Pausan. 2. 31. 8). Hence *ἀφοσιοῦσθαι* commonly = *to abominate* (*aversari*): see Holden on Plut. *Sull.* 22. 4, and Wyttenbach's list of examples in his n. on *mor.* 63 B.

254

ἠγόμην

254 Hesych. II p. 264 *ἠγόμην· διῆγον. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ δευτέρῳ.* The same interpretation was traditionally given to *O. T.* 775 *ἠγόμην δ' ἀνὴρ | ἀστῶν μέγιστος τῶν ἐκεῖ, πρίν μοι τύχη | τοιάδ' ἐπέστη*: see the schol. *ἐτρεφόμην, ἐτύγχανον*, and Suid. *s.v. ἠγόμην*. Modern editors all prefer the rendering 'I was considered'; but there is no gain to the sense in its adoption, and, if the editors are right, the present gloss of Hesychius does not deserve credit. Yet *ἠγόμην*, 'I lived,' seems to be justified by the corresponding use of the active in Dem. 9. 36 *ἦν τι τότε...ὃ ἐλευθέραν ἦγε τὴν Ἑλλάδα*: see also on Eur. *Hclid.* 788. Cf. *El.* 782, where Musgrave quoted Philostr. *vit. Apoll.* 5. 42 *μελιττούταις διήγετο καὶ ἄρτοις κτέ.* Several other examples from Philostratus are quoted by W. Schmid, *Atticismus*, IV p. 346.

255

ἔστι γάρ τις ἐναλία
Εὐβοιὶς αἶα· τῇδε βακχεῖος βότρυς

255. **2** *Εὐβοιὶς αἶα* L. Dindorf: *εὐβοήσασα* codd. plerique, *Εὐβοιὶς ἀκτή* Meineke | *βάκχιος* Blaydes

255 Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 227 *Σοφοκλῆς δὲ ἐν Θυέστῃ ἱστορεῖ καὶ παρ' Εὐβοιεῦσιν ὁμοίαν ἄμπελον εἶναι τῆς ἐν Παρνασῷ, λέγων οὕτως· 'ἔστι...ποτόν.'*

The miraculous growth of the vine is one of the portents which attest the presence of Dionysus (Hom. *h.* 7. 35 ff.); and this accounts for its appearance at Delphi and at Nysa. For the facts cf. schol. Soph. *Ant.* 1133 *ἢ τὸ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ φησὶν ἅλσος ἢ τὸ ἐν Παρνασῷ· ἐν ἀμφοτέροις γὰρ τόποις ἡ ἄμπελος ἢ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν περὶ μὲν τὴν ἕω βότρυας φέρει, περὶ δὲ τὴν μεσημβρίαν ὄμφακας, ἐτρυγᾶτο δὲ πεπανθεῖσα περὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν.* Steph. Byz. p. 479 *Νῦσαι...δεκάτη ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ, ἔνθα διὰ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τὴν ἄμπελόν φασιν ἀνθεῖν καὶ τὸν βότρυν πεπαίνεσθαι.* Schol. Townl. Hom. N 21 *ἐν Αἰγαῖς τῆς Εὐβοίας παράδοξα πολλὰ γίνεται. κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἐτησίους τοῦ Διονύσου τελετὰς ὀργιαζουσῶν τῶν μυστίδων γυναικῶν βλαστάνουσιν αἱ καλούμεναι ἐφήμεροι ἄμπελοι, αἵτινες ἕωθεν μὲν τὰς τῶν καρπῶν ἐκβολὰς ποιοῦνται, εἶτ' αὖ πάλιν βότρυας βαρυτάτους, καὶ τούτους πρὸ μεσημβρίας πεπαίνουσι, πρὸς*

ἐπ᾽ ἦμαρ ἕρπει. πρῶτα μὲν λαμπρᾶς ἕω
κεκλημάτωται χλωρὸν οἰνάνθης δέμας·
εἶτ᾽ ἦμαρ αὔξει μέσσον ὄμφακος τύπον,
καὶ κλίνεταί τε κἀποπερκοῦται βότρυς·

3 λαμπρᾶς ἕωι B, λαβρασεω A, λαβρᾶς H, λαβραδέω MT, λιβρᾶς ἕω M. Schmidt **4** χλωρὸν Bergk: χῶρον AMT, χῶρος BI | οἰνάνθης Barnes: οἰάνθης I, οἰάνθῃς B, εἰανθὲς AMT **5** ἦμαρ αὔξει Palat. 343. ἦμαρ ἄξει TAB, ἡμαράξει M | μέσσον codd. meliores **6** καὶ κλίνεταί τε B: καὶ κλίνεταί γε vulgo

ὃς τὴν ἑσπέραν δρεπόμεναι ἄκρατον χορηγοῦσι δαψιλῆ ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ παρθένοις. Eustath. *Il.* p. 882, 38 Αἴγλη ἡ τὰς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ λέγει, ἔνθα μυθεύεται τὸ κατὰ τὰς ἐφημέρους ἀμπέλους, αἳ, φασίν, ἔωθεν ἀνθοῦσαι, πρὸς μεσημβρίαν πεπαίνουσι βότρυας. ἑσπέρας δὲ ἄκρατον χορηγοῦσι δαψιλῆ τῷ χορῷ τῶν τελουμένων τῷ Διονύσῳ κτέ. From such evidence it has been inferred with reason that Nysa was in the immediate neighbourhood of Aegae, a town on the west coast of Euboea. From Strab. 405 we learn that Aegae was opposite to Anthedon at a distance of 120 stades across the Euripus. The similar vine on Mt Parnassus is described in Eur. *Phoen.* 229 οἶνα θ᾽, ἃ καθαγίσματ᾽ ἀστάζει τὸν πολύκαρπον | οἰνάνθας ἱερὰ βότρυν. For Nysa see on fr. 959.

2 βακχεῖος: see cr. n. Our MSS are useless in distinguishing between βάκχιος and βακχεῖος, as is shown by *Ant.* 154, *Trach.* 219, 510, 704, in all of which places they give forms of βακχεῖος against the metre. The only certain instance of βακχεῖος in Sophocles is *O. T.* 1105. In Euripides βακχεῖος is certain in *Hec.* 686, *Ion* 1126, *Bacch.* 1057; and Elmsley on *Bacch.* 308 held that Euripides avoided βάκχιος, except as the name of the god. These facts are hardly sufficient to warrant the adoption of βακχιος, although it may very well be right. For the accentuation βακχεῖος rather than βάκχειος see Chandler, § 381.

3 ἐπ᾽ ἦμαρ ἕρπει, *grows for a day* — and no more. We should not render *every day* (καθ᾽ ἡμέραν): there is a distinction between *O. C.* 1364 ἄλλους ἐκπρὸ τὸν καθ᾽ ἡμέραν βίον—'my daily bread' and Eur. *El.* 429 τῆι δ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἡμέραν βορᾶι | ἐς σωτῆρα ἥκει (sc. τὰ χρήματα)—'wealth hath small part in the day's needs.' Similarly *Cycl.* 336 τοὐμοῦ γε κἀφαγεῖν τοὐφ᾽ ἡμέραν—'my portion for the day.' J. quotes Hdt. 1. 32 οὐ γάρ τι ὁ μέγα πλουτέων τοῦ ἐπ᾽ ἡμέρην ἕκαστος ὀλιγώτερα ἐστί, Eur. *Phoen.* 401 πότε μὲν ἐπ᾽ ἦμαρ εἶχον, εἶτ᾽ οὐκ εἶχον ἄν.

M. Schmidt's λιβρᾶς (cr. n.) is based on λιβρὸν σέλας (Tr. fr. adesp. 232).

4 κεκλημάτωται: 'the green vine-shoot puts forth its tendril.' The early growth of the vine is described distributively in respect of each twig. The proper meaning of οἰνάνθη is given by schol. Ar. *Av.* 588 as ἡ πρώτη ἔκφυσις τῆς σταφυλῆς: so Hesych., Suid., schol. Ar. *Kan.* 1320. It should be observed that in none of the passages quoted by L. and S. for that meaning is οἰνάνθη used for the vine itself. There is consequently the less reason for following J., who, taking οἰνάνθης δέμας as the vine-stock, treated χλωρόν as proleptic: 'the stock of the vine has put forth green shoots.' The perfect is gnomic as in *El.* 64 εἶθ᾽ ὅταν δόμους | ἔλθωσιν αὖθις, ἐκτετίμηνται πλέον. See Gildersleeve, § 257, Goodw. § 155.

5 μέσσον is used by Sophocles in dialogue also at *Ant.* 1223, 1236. Eur. only employs the form in lyrics. In this respect the Ionism of Sophocles is well-known: see on fr. 799. 4.—**ὄμφακος τύπον**, *the form of the unripe grape.*

6 καὶ κλίνεταί τε is undoubtedly right. Such conjectures as πεπαίνεταί τε (Nauck) and γλυκαίνεταί τε (Meineke) are quite beside the mark, as was recognized by Gomperz and independently by Headlam. 'And, as it wanes, the cluster is empurpled.' For the use of τε...καί in place of ὅτε of contemporaneous events see Kuehner-Gerth, § 516, 8 (II 231), and H. on Aesch. *Ag.* 189. The credit of first advocating the claims of τε here belongs to Wex on *Ant.* 1164 (1186).—**κἀποπερκοῦται** expresses the final change of colour when the grape is ripe: see n. on Eur. *Phoen.* 1160. There is a good illustration in Achill. Tat. 2. 3, describing the appearance of a gemmed cup: οἱ δὲ βότρυες πάντῃ περιερρωγότες· ὑμφαξ μὲν αὐτῶν ἕκαστος ὅσον ἦν κενὸς ὁ κρατήρ· ἐὰν δ᾽ ἐγχέῃς οἶνον, κατὰ μικρὸν ὁ βότρυς ὑποπερκάζεται καὶ σταφυλὴν τὴν ὑμφακα ποιεῖ. For this sense of

δείλῃ δὲ πᾶσα τέμνεται βλαστουμένη
ὀπώρα καλῶς κἀνακίρναται ποτόν.

7 βλαστουμένη vix sanum **8** καλῶς ὀπώρα Barnes | κἀκκιρνᾶται A

σταφυλή cf. *A. P.* 5. 303 ὄμφαξ οὐκ ἐπένευσας· ὅτ' ἦς σταφυλή, παρεπέμψω κτέ. There does not seem to be any reason for preferring κἀπιπερκοῦται, as suggested by Nauck: in *A. P.* 11. 36 (quoted on *Phoen. l.c.*) the conditions are different. In Chaeremon fr. 12 πολλὴν ὀπώραν Κύπριδος εἰσορᾶν παρῆν | ἄκραισι περκάζουσαν οἰνάνθαις χρόνου (γένυν conj. Kaibel) the text is corrupt, but the reference is clearly to early maturity.

7 f. βλαστουμένη is generally considered to be corrupt, but no satisfactory emendation has been proposed. Meineke's κλάστου χερί ('κλαστουμένη would be better' H. [cf. *C. R.* XVIII 243]: alternatives are τέχνῃ or μένει, the latter suggested but not approved by Herwerden), which he subsequently gave up in favour of βλαστοῦ γονὴ | ὀπωροκλάστῃ κᾷτα, is put out of court by the consideration that an allusion to the vine-dresser's art is irrelevant: not trimming the leaves to let the fruit ripen, but gathering it when ripe is the process to which a reference is required. Barnes's alteration in the order of the words—καλῶς ὀπώρα—is probably right, and the error may be due, as H. thought, to what he called 'simple order' (*C. R.* XVI 245). On the other hand R. Ellis conjectured ὀπωριαῖος for ὀπώρα καλῶς. But καλῶς itself is not satisfactory, at any rate so long as βλαστουμένη stands: neither Campbell's 'attaining a perfect *growth*,' nor J.'s '*in* its full growth'—lit. 'growing *perfectly*' can be maintained. Even if the form is legitimate, βλ. ὀπώρα (=the ripe fruit growing) is an odd phrase. The existence of a transitive βλαστέω is proved by Ap. Rhod. 1. 1131, and that of the passive by Philo's βίος βλαστηθείς (1 667 M.); but the present tense is in any case out of place here. Bergk's ἐβλαστημένη avoided this difficulty. *Trach.* 703 γλαυκῆς ὀπώρας ὥστε πίονος ποτοῦ χυθέντος εἰς γῆν Βακχίας ἀπ' ἀμπέλου shows that ποτόν is the juice of the grape, and we should expect to find some allusion not merely to the gathering of the vintage, but to the pouring of the fruit into the vat or its treading by the vintagers. The first requirement would be satisfied by τρυγωμένῃ, the second by τραπουμένη or πατουμένη—or even by βατουμένη (cf. ληνοβάτης), the last a word which might possibly have given place to βλαστουμένη, but like τραπουμένη and πατουμένη cannot be combined with τέμνεται. Perhaps τέμνεται, βατουμένης ὅπως ὀπώρας κἀνακίρνηται ποτόν. Observe how easily ὅπως would have been lost, which would lead to subsequent patching. Herwerden proposed βάκχαις for καλῶς on the strength of schol. Hom. N 21 quoted above.

256

πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην οὐδ' Ἄρης ἀνθίσταται.

256 Stob. *ecl.* 1 4. 5, p. 71, 20 W. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ. 'πρὸς...ἀνθίσταται' (the lemma is omitted from the proper place by codd. FP of Stobaeus, but given after the conclusion of the following extract). The line is also quoted but with the corruption οὐδεὶς οὐδ' for οὐδ' Ἄρης, in a Paris MS. described by Wilh. Meyer *Sitz. d. philol.-philos. hist. Cl. d. k. b. Akad.* 1890 II 2, p. 370.

The sentiment follows Simon. fr. 5, 16 ἀνάγκᾳ δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται, *O. C.* 191 καὶ μὴ χρείᾳ πολεμῶμεν, *Ant.* 1106 ἀνάγκῃ δ' οὐχὶ δυσμαχητέον: see also on fr. 757, 3. The theme is varied here by the introduction of Ares, the embodiment of physical strength: Bacchyl. fr. 36 (20 J.) ἄκαμπτος Ἄρης, Homer's πελώριος, Aesch. fr. 74, Tr. fr. adesp. 129 πολέμοις δ' Ἄρεως κρείσσον' ἔχων δύναμιν. Nauck is probably justified in thinking that this passage is alluded to in Plat. *Symp.* 196 C καὶ μὴν εἰς γε ἀνδρείαν Ἔρωτι οὐδ' Ἄρης ἀνθίσταται.

257

ὡς νυν τάχος στείχωμεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως
σπουδῆς δικαίας μῶμος ἄψεταί ποτε.

257. **1** ὡς νυν Dindorf: ὡς νῦν SMA **2** ἄψεται ποτε Valckenaer: ἅπτεται ποτε SMA

257 Stob. *flor.* 29. 1 (III p. 626, 6 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Θυέστῃ. '*ὡς...ποτε.*'

1 **ὡς νυν**, independently suggested by Campbell, seems to be necessary. *ὡς τάχος* occurs frequently in Sophocles (cf. *Phil.* 924, *O. T.* 945, 1154, *O. C.* 1398, 1461, *Ai.* 578, 593), but could not be severed by *νῦν*. On the other hand, *ὡς* cannot be a final conjunction, since *τάχος* standing alone is not used adverbially by Sophocles. The arguments for the enclitic are similar to those which have led to its adoption in *El.* 428, *O. C.* 465, and elsewhere.

2 For **δικαίας** F. W. Schmidt conjectured *δικαίως*; but, though at first sight attractive, this alteration really obscures the character of the allusion. The proverb here paraphrased, that hard work brings fame, or that idleness begets disgrace, may be seen in several fragments of Euripides: fr. 134 *εὐκλειαν ἔλαβον οὐκ ἄνευ πολλῶν πόνων*, fr. 238 *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἡδέως ζητῶν βιοῦν | εὐκλειαν εἰσέκτησατ', ἀλλὰ χρὴ πονεῖν*, fr. 237 *οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὧν ῥᾴθυμος εὐκλεὴς ἀνήρ. | ἀλλ' οἱ πόνοι τίκτουσι τὴν εὐδοξίαν*, fr. 474 *πόνος γάρ, ὡς λέγουσιν, εὐκλείας πατήρ.* Cf. Theodect. fr. 11 *πολλὰ δεῖ | μοχθεῖν τὸν ἤξοντ' εἰς ἔπαινον εὐκλεῶς· | ῥᾳθυμία δὲ κτέ.* Herw., who proposed *δίκαιοι* or *δικαίως*, was subsequently inclined to accept the text.—**ἄψεται**: see cr. n. The future is more idiomatic than the present after *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως*, unless another negative qualifies the subordinate verb. See Eilendt, *s.v. ὅπως*, p. 535 a.

258

ἔχει μὲν ἀλγεῖν', οἶδα· πειρᾶσθαι δ' <ὅμως>
[ὡς ῥᾷστα τἀναγκαῖα τοῦ βίου φέρειν]
ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων χρή τιν' ἴασιν λαβεῖν.

258. **1** ἔχειν Itali | ἀλγεινὰ M, ἀλγεῖν ἃ A | δ' ὅμως exempli causa scripsi: δὲ χρὴ MA **2** iure delet Badham ut ex Euripide ortum **3** χρὴ τὴν MA, δή τιν Badham | ἴασιν M

258 Stob. *flor.* 108. 21 (IV p. 963, 8 Hense) Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ. '*ἔχει...λαβεῖν.*' The extract is omitted in S.

Either in the archetype of Stobaeus, or in some older anthology from which it was derived, there has been a confusion of two quotations, which has further led to a corruption of the original text. The extract which follows in Meineke's text (32 = 52 Hense) is taken from Eur. *Hel.* 253 f. *ἔχειν μὲν ἀλγεῖν', οἶδα· συμφορὰν δέ σοι | ὡς ῥᾷστα τἀναγκαῖα τοῦ βίου φέρειν.* The sentiment expressed by this couplet, 'what can't be cured must be endured,' recurs in many forms: see the closely parallel words of fr. 585 and cf. Eur. fr. 339. 5 *σκαιὸν τι δὴ τὸ χρῆμα γιγνεσθαι φιλεῖ, | θεῶν ἀνάγκαις ὅστις ἰᾶσθαι θέλει.* But the thought of the present fragment—that trouble must be faced, and if possible a remedy discovered—is entirely different: cf. Eur. *Or.* 398 *λύπη μάλιστά γ' ἡ διαφθείρουσά με·* | ΜΕ. *δεινὴ γὰρ ἡ θεός, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἰάσιμος.* The two passages are not consecutive in the MSS, but were so placed by Gaisford. In Hense's text they are separated by a considerable interval. S, which omits the quotation from Sophocles, has *γρ. πειρᾶσθαι δὲ χρή* written over *σύμφορον δέ σοι* in Euripides. Apparently the accidental similarity of the opening words tempted someone to combine the two fragments without regard to their inconsistency; and, in order to connect *πειρᾶσθαι* with the following line, he substituted

δὲ χρή for δ' ὅμως or δέ σε or whatever the original ending may have been (Blaydes makes the same suggestion). I think it is more likely that χρή arose in this way in v. 1 than that Badham's δή τιν' should be accepted in v. 3. F. W. Schmidt followed Badham, and also without necessity gave ἑλκῶν for ἐκ τῶν. Hense thinks that v. 3 alone belongs to Sophocles, and that its context is lost. He formerly conjectured ἔκλυσιν χρηστήν for χρή τιν' ἴασιν, thinking that ἔκλυσιν was glossed by ἴασιν: but see Eur. *Or.* 399 quoted above. ἔκλυσιν was introduced in order to provide a support for ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων, but the latter is perfectly good Greek for 'in such a case.' Cf. *Trach.* 1109 τήν γε δράσασαν τάδε | χειρώσομαι κἀκ τῶνδε, 'even as I am.' *Ai.* 537 τί δῆτ' ἂν ὡς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἂν ὠφελοίμί σε;

259

ἔνεστι γάρ τις καὶ λόγοισιν ἡδονή,
λήθην ὅταν ποιῶσι τῶν ὄντων κακῶν.

259 Stob. *flor.* 113. 12 (IV p. 1015, 5 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Θυέστῃ. 'ἔνεστι... κακῶν.'

1 f. These lines refer to the consolation of friends: cf. Aesch. *Prom.* 394 ὀργῆς νοσούσης εἰσὶν ἰατροὶ λόγοι, Eur. fr. 1079 οὐκ ἔστι λύπης ἄλλο φάρμακον βροτοῖς | ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἐσθλοῦ καὶ φίλου παραίνεσις, fr. 1065 λόγοι γὰρ ἐσθλοὶ φάρμακον φόβου βροτοῖς, fr. 962 ἄλλ' ἐπ' ἄλλῃ φάρμακον κεῖται νόσῳ· | λυπουμένῳ μὲν μῦθος εὐμενὴς φίλων, Tr. fr. adesp. 317 λόγῳ μ' ἔπεισας φαρμάκῳ σοφωτάτῳ, Menand. fr. 559, III 170 K. λύπης ἰατρός ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις λόγος· | ψυχῆς γὰρ οὗτος μόνος ἔχει θελκτήρια κτέ. Consolation was regarded as a formal duty, and the rules to be observed became a branch of casuistry: see n. on Cleanth. fr. 93.—**καὶ λόγοισιν.** Nauck approves Naber's κἀν λόγοισιν (*O. C.* 116), a correction anticipated by Wagner; but the text may well be right: cf. *El.* 369 ὡς τοῖς λόγοις ἔνεστιν ἀμφοῖν κέρδος.—**λήθην**: cf. Eur. *Or.* 213 ὦ πότνια λήθη τῶν κακῶν, ὡς εἶ σοφή.—**ὄντων** is equivalent to παρόντων: *Trach.* 330 μηδὲ πρὸς κακοῖς | τοῖς οὖσιν ἄλλην πρός γ' ἐμοῦ λύπην λάβῃ, *El.* 1498 τά τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα Πελοπαδῶν κακά, *O. T.* 781 τὴν μὲν οὖσαν ἡμέραν | μόλις κατέσχον, θατέρᾳ δ' ἰὼν κτέ.

260

καίπερ γέρων ὤν· ἀλλὰ τῷ γήρᾳ φιλεῖ
χὠ νοῦς ὁμαρτεῖν καὶ τὸ βουλεύειν ἃ δεῖ.

260 Stob. *flor.* 115. 16 (IV p. 1023, 11 Hense) Σοφοκλέους Θυέστῃ (the name of the play is omitted by S). 'καίπερ...δεῖ.'

Hyperides (fr. 57 K.) is said to have attributed to Hesiod the line ἔργα νέων, βουλαὶ δὲ μέσων, εὐχαὶ δὲ γερόντων. But more often action and counsel are opposed as the respective provinces of young and old: *Paroem.* I 436 νέοις μὲν ἔργα, βουλὰς δὲ γεραιτέροις, Pind. fr. 199 ἔνθα βουλαὶ μὲν γερόντων | καὶ νέων ἀνδρῶν ἀριστεύοισιν αἰχμαί, Eur. fr. 508 παλαιὸς αἶνος· ἔργα μὲν νεωτέρων, | βουλαὶ δ' ἔχουσι τῶν γεραιτέρων κράτος. Cf. Hom. Δ 323. Generally, age has a riper intelligence and a wider experience: Diog. L. 4. 50 (Bion) τῇ μὲν ἀνδρείᾳ νέους ὄντας ἔφη χρῆσθαι, τῇ δὲ φρονήσει γηράσκοντας ἀκμάζειν, *Ant.* 1353, *infr.* fr. 664, Antiph. fr. 3 (*TGF* p. 793), Eur. fr. 619, *Phoen.* 529 ἡμπειρία | ἔχει τι λέξαι τῶν νέων σοφώτερον (n.). Hence the rebuke addressed to Creon: *O. C.* 930 καί σ' ὁ πληθύων χρόνος | γέρονθ' ὁμοῦ τίθησι καὶ τοῦ νοῦ κενόν. Contrast fr. 949.—Wecklein conjectured κἄστιν γέρων μέν, but for the παρήχησις see Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 533, Lobeck on *Ai.* 384. Ellendt rightly objected to the comma placed by Dindorf after ὤν, as if the participle were structurally related to the following words rather than to the preceding clause. Hense thinks that something like οὐκ ἄτιμός ἐστ' ἀνήρ may have gone before.

261

ἀκήρυκτον

261 Hesych. 1 p. 97 ἀκήρυκτον· ἄγνωστον. ἀφανὲς δὲ Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ. Cf. *Etym. Gud.* p. 25, 51 ἀκήρυκτον, ἄγνωστον, ἄφωνον, καὶ μέγα καὶ εὐδιάλλακτον (l. ἀδιάλλακτον). The gloss 'unknown' fits Eur. *Helid.* 89 οὐ γὰρ σῶμ' ἀκήρυκτον τόδε. In *Trach.* 45 χρόνον γὰρ οὐχὶ βαιὸν...ἀκήρυκτος μένει the meaning is 'without having sent any message' (ἄσημος, οὐ μηνυόμενος ὅπου πότ' ἐστιν schol.); and the neuter seems to have been applied similarly to something which had vanished from human ken.

262

ἄλογα

262 Hesych. 1 p. 130 ἄλογα· ἄρρητα. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ. Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 80, 13 = Bekk. *anecd.* p. 385, 16 ἄλογα· ἄρρητα. Σοφοκλῆς.

There is no other example of ἄλογος in this sense. In Plat. *Theaet.* 202 B, where the στοιχεῖα, as ἄλογα and ἄγνωστα, are contrasted with συλλαβὰς γνωστάς τε καὶ ῥητάς, the translation *inarticulate* perhaps comes nearest; and throughout that passage Plato twists ἄλογος to serve his purpose, but without affording a parallel to Sophocles. Cf. ἄφθεγκτος, ἀφώνητος.

263

ἀλωπός

263 Hesych. 1 p. 136 ἀλωπός· ἀλωπεκώδης, πανοῦργος. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ Ἰνάχῳ (fr. 293). οἱ δὲ ἀφανὴς (ἀφανεῖς cod.) καὶ (del. Blaydes) κατὰ τὴν πρόσοψιν (πρόσωψιν cod.). Cf. *Etym. M.* p. 75, 5 ἀλωπός· ἀλωπεκώδης καὶ πανοῦργος. οἱ δὲ ἀφελὴς (l. ἀφανὴς) κατὰ πρόσοψιν (so Valckenaer for καὶ ἀπρόσοψις). M. Schmidt, by comparing Eustath. *Od.* p. 1392, 33 κεῖται ἐν ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ (Ael. Dionys. fr. 348 Schw.) ἀλαωπὸς σύνθετος ὁ ἀφανὴς ἢ ὁ τυφλός, showed that the words οἱ δὲ ἀφανὴς κτέ. relate to the lost lemma ἀλαωπός. The gloss seems to have been wrongly brought into connexion with ἀλωπός, transferred from its proper alphabetical position, and finally truncated. This may have a bearing on fr. 293. Musurus altered the reference to Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ = καὶ = Ἰνάχῳ: for M. Schmidt's view see on fr. 419.

Whatever be the right restoration of the corrupt text of Hesychius, it seems certain that in the *Thyestes* ἀλωπός appeared as an adjective with the meaning 'crafty.' There is hardly any reputable authority for the word either as noun or adjective, but the accent is recorded by Arcad. p. 67, 23. Cobet (*N. L.* p. 170) showed that ἀλωπόχρους in Bekk. *anecd.* p. 381, 11 is an error for ἀλφιτόχρους. The same mistake occurs in Eustath. *Od.* p. 1968, 39. The form does not appear to be open to objection on philological grounds: see the list of cognates given by H. D. Darbishire, *Rell. philol.* p. 92. The corresponding feminine is given by Hesych. as ἀλωπά· ἡ ἀλώπηξ. The cunning of the fox was proverbial ever since Solon's ὑμέων δ' εἷς μὲν ἕκαστος ἀλώπεκος ἴχνεσι βαίνει (fr. 11).

264

ἀνοσήλευτον

264 Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 144, 9 *ἀνοσήλευτον· Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ.*

Presumably the word means 'untended' rather than 'not tainted with disease.' But for the fluctuating sense of *νοσηλεία* see Jebb on *Phil.* 39. For the verb cf. fr. 215.

265

ἀνταίρουσιν

265 Hesych. 1 p. 209 *ἀντεροῦσιν· ἀντιλέγουσι. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ. ἀνταίρουσιν* was restored by I. Voss, and its correctness is proved by the alphabetical order in Hesychius. *ἀνταίρω*, which H. once proposed to read in Aesch. *Ag.* 543 (*J. P.* XX 299), does not occur in the extant remains of tragedy and is severely limited in its Attic usage. Still there is no reason to discredit the statement of Hesychius, although I have been unable to find any instance where *ἀνταίρω* is used of *verbal* opposition. But Suid. has *ἀνταίρω. δοτικῶς· φιλονεικῶ*, and Plut. employs the word metaphorically with considerable freedom: *Cat. ma.* 3 *Σκηπίωνι πρὸς τὴν Φαβίου δύναμιν ἀνταίροντι, Pyrrh.* 15 *τόλμῃ καὶ ῥώμῃ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνταίροντα πρὸς τὴν ἀπορίαν, aud. poet.* 9 p. 28 D *ἀνταίρειν τῇ τύχῃ.*

266

ἀπείρονας

266 Hesych. 1 p. 231 *ἀπείρονας· ἀπειράτους. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ.*

Ellendt strangely remarks that Hesychius 'haud dubie *ἀπεράντους* intellexit,' and refers to fr. 526. But *ἀπείρατος* regularly means 'inexperienced,' and *ἀπείρων* is so used in *O. T.* 1088 *οὐ τὸν Ὄλυμπον ἀπείρων, ὦ Κιθαιρών, οὐκ ἔσῃ κτέ.*

267

ἀπόθεα

267 Hesych. 1 p. 246 *ἀπόθεα· ἄθεα, ἐκτὸς θεῶν. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ.*

ἀπόθεα, *godless deeds*, was a synonym for *ἄθεα*. Cf. *ἀπάνθρωπος*, = *inhuman*, fr. 1020, and Hesych. *ἀπόθριξ· ἄνηβος. ἄθριξ.* See also on fr. 558.

268

ἀτελῆ

268 Hesych. 1 p. 312 *ἀτελῆ· ἀδάπανα, οὐκ ἔχοντα τελέσματα. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ.* Cf. Pausan. (fr. 305 Schw.) ap. Eustath. *Il.* p. 881, 26 (= Bekk. *anecd.* p. 458, 26) *ἀτελῆ τὰ ἀδάπανα, ὡς καὶ πολυτελῆ τὰ πολυδάπανα.* Suid. *s.v.*

ἀτελής thus becomes the equivalent of *εὐτελής*, by which a schol. on *Phil.* 842 wrongly interprets it. Cf. Amphis (fr. 29, II 244 K.) *δεῖπνον γὰρ ἀτελὲς οὐ ποιεῖ παροινίαν* (Plut. *Num.* 15 *δεῖπνον εὐτελὲς πάνυ*). It should be added that *εὐτελής* and *ἀτελής* are sometimes confused (so Reiske restored *εὐτελῶς* in Plut. *mor.* 472 F), and the earlier editors of Athenaeus (421 A) gave *εὐτελές* in the text of Amphis on inferior authority. Headlam (*J. P.* XXXI 9) remarked that Horace was rendering *ἀτελής* in his *immunis aram si tetigit manus* (*Carm.* 3. 23. 17).

269

ἐντέλλω

269 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 94, 8 ἐντέλλω· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐντέλλομαι. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ.

The active only occurs elsewhere in Pind. *Ol.* 7. 40 μέλλον ἐντείλειν φυλάξασθαι χρέος. Sophocles also employs the rare active forms μηχανᾶν (*Ai.* 1037) and ἀτιμᾶν (*ibid.* 1129).

ΙΒΗΡΕΣ

This title is known from an inscription published by Kaibel in *Herm.* XXIII 283 (from the papers of Ph. Bonnarot), which records the performance at Rhodes in the third or fourth century B.C. of four Sophoclean plays...*ἐα* Σοφοκλέους *καὶ* Ὀδυσσέ<*α* κ>*αὶ* Ἴβηρας *καὶ σατυρικὸν* Τήλε<φον>. The fact of the performance at that place and time is an important record: see Introduction, § 3. The legend of Geryon is the only subject suggested by the title *Iberians*, but seems more suitable to a satyr-play than a tragedy. For the *Geryones* of Nicomachus see *TGF*, p. 762. The Caucasian Iberia, where Heracles overcame Glaucus, the Old Man of the Sea (schol. Ap. Rhod. 2. 767), is still less likely.

ΙΝΑΧΟΣ

The story of Io was contained in two epics attributed to Hesiod, the *Aegimius* and *καταλογοι*, but the information relating to them is so scanty that it is impossible to reconstruct either version in detail[1]. The other literary evidence anterior to Sophocles consists of the incidents recorded in the *Supplices* and *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, to which there is now to be added the dithyramb of Bacchylides (18). In Apollod. 2. 5 ff. we find a version of the story which differs in several respects from Aeschylus, and appears to be founded on Hesiod. Thus we learn that Hesiod made Io the daughter of Peiren,—not of Inachus, as many tragic writers had done. Further, whereas in Aeschylus (*Suppl.* 303) Hera transformed Io into a cow to thwart the passion of Zeus, according to Hesiod Zeus, after his intrigue was detected, himself effected the change, and Hera, having asked for the cow as a present, set Argus to watch over it. He accordingly tethered Io to an olive-tree in the ἄλσος at Mycenae. There was also a difference of tradition in the

[1] See the authorities referred to by Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1130, and in *Jahresb.* CXXXVII 526—531.

accounts given of the death of Argus. In the *Prometheus* (707) Aeschylus speaks vaguely of his sudden and unexpected end, and in the *Supplices* (309) merely states that he was killed by Hermes. According to Apollodorus (2. 7), who appears to be following Hesiod (fr. 189 Rz.), Hermes was bidden by Zeus to steal the cow, and, failing to elude Argus, killed him with a stone. But Ovid's account (*Met.* 1 668 ff.) is different: Hermes disguised himself as a shepherd, excited the curiosity of Argus by playing on the pipe, and, when he had eventually succeeded in lulling him to sleep, slew him with the ἅρπη. The antiquity of the latter version is proved by Bacchylides (18. 29—36), who, in refusing to pronounce definitely on the manner of Argus's death, mentions, as an alternative, that he may have been 'lulled to rest by the sweet melody of the Pierian sisters' (see Jebb *in loc.*).

The inference that the *Inachus* was a satyr-play was first drawn by Hemsterhuis[1], and the general tone of the fragments has convinced the majority of subsequent critics that he was right, although Bergk[2] and Wilamowitz[3] were of a different opinion. The latter considered that the play was technically a tragedy in spite of its jovial character, and compared it to the *Alcestis* of Euripides. I doubt if the analogy will hold. The comic element in the *Alcestis* is slight enough; yet the ancient critics thought it σατυρικώτερον, and the general opinion is summarized by Demetr. *de eloc.* 169 τραγῳδία δὲ χάριτας μὲν παραλαμβάνει ἐν πολλοῖς, ὁ δὲ γέλως ἐχθρὸς τραγῳδίας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπινοήσειεν ἄν τις τραγῳδίαν παίζουσαν, ἐπεὶ σάτυρον γράψει ἀντὶ τραγῳδίας. So much was this the case that Rhinthon of Tarentum, a specimen of whose art is perhaps preserved in the *Amphitryo* of Plautus, was regarded as the inventor of a new type of drama known as ἱλαροτραγῳδία. Wilamowitz has a formidable argument in the fact that twenty-six quotations from the play have come down to us without any hint that it was satyric; and it is perhaps not an adequate answer to point out that the same remark applies to the nine fragments belonging to the Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταί. But the more famous the play the less need was there to cite it with a title distinctive of its character; and it is common ground that the *Inachus* was much more popular than any of the plays of Sophocles which are definitely known as satyric[4]. It should be added that the death of Argus is a

[1] On Ar. *Plut.* p. 248. [2] *Griech. Literaturgesch.* III p. 441.

[3] *Einleitung in d. gr. Trag.* p. 88_{63}. Decharme (*Rev. des Ét. gr.* XII 298), arguing rightly that a chorus of satyrs was indispensable in a satyr-play, thinks that the *Inachus* perhaps did not belong to this category.

[4] I do not feel the force of the argument that frs. 270—1 are unsuitable to a satyr-chorus. Consider, on the other hand, the cumulative force of frs. 272, 277, 279, 284, 285, 288, 291, 295.

favourite subject in vase-paintings, and on one of these Hermes is represented as trying to kill Argus, who is asleep on the ground, but as being held back by satyrs[1]. Even if this does not refer directly to the *Inachus*, it is sufficient to show that the subject was suitable for satyric treatment.

Something may be gathered from the fragments themselves as to the scope of the play. Inachus, the river-god, was the father of Io (frs. 270, 271, 284); but there is nothing to show what part he took in the action. It may be assumed that the scene of the play was the flowery vale of Argos, rich with pasture, where Io ranged before her wanderings began: cf. *El.* 5 *τῆς οἰστροπλήγος ἄλσος Ἰνάχου κόρης.* Aesch. *Suppl.* 538 *ἀνθονόμους ἐπωπάς, | λειμῶνα βούχιλον, ἔνθεν Ἰὼ κτέ.* This description of the Argive plain (*πολυδίψιον*: see generally Frazer *Pausan.* III p. 96) might well excite surprise; but Headlam has pointed out that it refers to the particular circumstances of the legend, by quoting Severus in Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* I p. 537 *τιμῶσα ἡ γῆ τὴν τοῦ Διὸς ἐρωμένην ἄνθος ἀνῆκε τῇ βοΐ νέμεσθαι.* It is perhaps not altogether fanciful to connect the allusion of the rhetorician with the account given in the *Inachus* of the blessings bestowed on the inhabitants of Argos when Zeus came to visit Io (frs. 273, 275, 277, 286). To Inachus in particular, as the source of nourishment for all the dwellers on his banks (Aesch. fr. 168, Tucker on Aesch. *Cho.* 6), the increase of fertility brought enlarged honours. Hermes and Iris appeared as the agents of Zeus and Hera (fr. 272),—themselves too august personages for stage representation. The transformation of Io[2] took place during the course of the action (fr. 279), but whether as a direct result of Hera's interference must be left doubtful. Wilamowitz argues from frs. 278, 284, and 286 that Hera effected a counter-stroke by reducing the land to poverty as a punishment for the complicity of its inhabitants in the wrong done to her. Argus was introduced blowing the shepherd's pipe (fr. 281); and this reference, taken in conjunction with Aesch. *Prom.* 596 and the allusion in Bacchylides to the fatal issue of his musical tastes, favours the inference that his death was brought about somewhat in the manner related by Ovid. The play probably closed with the departure of Io on her wanderings. Wilamowitz assigns the play to the end of the Archidamian war, presumably on the strength of schol. Ar. *Av.* 1203.

[1] Described by O. Jahn in *Berichte d. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch.* 1847, p. 196. See Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 392.

[2] The fragments do not show whether she was completely transformed; but, if she appeared afterwards, it must have been as *βούκερως παρθένος* (Engelmann in Roscher II 271).

270

Ἴναχε νᾶτορ, παῖ τοῦ κρηνῶν
πατρὸς Ὠκεανοῦ, μέγα πρεσβεύων
Ἄργους τε γύαις Ἥρας τε πάγοις
καὶ Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς.

270. **1** νᾶτορ Meineke: γεννάτορ A, γεν νάτορ B **4** Τυρσηνοῖσι schol. Ap. Rhod.: Τυρρηνοῖς codd. Dion. Hal.

270 These lines are adduced by Dionys. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1. 25 Σοφοκλεῖ δ' ἐν Ἰνάχῳ δράματι ἀνάπαιστον ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ λεγόμενον πεποίηται ὧδε ''Ἴναχε... Πελασγοῖς' in support of the proposition that the name of Tyrrhenia was in former times distributed over different parts of Greece. V. 4 is quoted by schol. Ap. Rhod. 1. 580 ὅτι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἐκαλοῦντο Πελασγοὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ φησί 'καὶ Τ. Πελασγοῖς.'

1 f. **Ἴναχε**: for the course of the river Inachus see on fr. 271.—**νᾶτορ**: in support of his correction Meineke (on Callimachus, p. 250) quotes Hesych. III p. 137 ναέτωρ· ῥέων, πολύρροος, and p. 141 νατταρέον· πολύρρουν (*i.e.* νάτωρ· ῥέων, πολύρροος). Empedocles fr. 6 introduces Νῆστις as the representative of Water in his list of the four elements. Cf. νᾶ fr. 5.—**τοῦ κρηνῶν πατρός**. Cf. Hom. Φ 196 Ὠκεανοῖο, | ἐξ οὗπερ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα | καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι... νάουσιν. Ar. *Nub.* 271. The rationalizing version is given by Apollod. 2. 1 Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος γίνεται παῖς Ἴναχος, ἀφ' οὗ ποταμὸς ἐν Ἄργει Ἴναχος καλεῖται.—**πρεσβεύων** (*Ai.* 1389), followed by Homeric (perhaps locative) dative (Monro, *H. G.* § 145, 7).

3 **Ἥρας τε πάγοις**: 'alluding to the Argive Heraeum, which stood on a rocky eminence under Mt Euboea, one of the heights which bound the Argive plain on the E. (*El.* 8 n.)' J. But, as Hera was the patron goddess of all Argos (Eur. *Hclid.* 349, *Phoen.* 1365 etc.), it is perhaps unnecessary so to restrict the plural πάγοις. Poseidon sent a drought, being angry with Inachus, διότι τὴν χώραν Ἥρας ἐμαρτύρησεν εἶναι (Apollod. 2. 13). See also Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1829.

4 **Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς**. J. writes: 'As we know from Dionysius, it is the Chorus who speak. They would be Argives, and here speak of their own race, with pride, as sprung from the ancient stock of the Pelasgi. Cp. Thuc. 4. 109, who traces a Pelasgic element in the Athos peninsula, descended from τῶν καὶ Λῆμνόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων. In the fifth century the view prevailed that the Τυρσηνοί and Pelasgi were identical. [In Hdt. 1. 57 τοῖσι νῦν ἔτι Πελασγῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν Κρηστῶνα πόλιν οἰκεόντων, Κρότωνα, *i.e.* Cortona—with Κροτωνιῆται for Κρηστωνιῆται below—should perhaps be substituted: see Stein.] Hellanicus (fr. 1, *FHG* I 45) says that the Pelasgi acquired the name of Τυρσηνοί after their arrival in Italy. The Etruscans were believed to have come originally from Lydia (Hdt. 1. 94). Herodotus (8. 73) regards the people of Cynuria in the S. of Argolis as having been originally Pelasgic. So the inhabitants of Achaia, he says, were originally called Pelasgi, and acquired the name of Ionians only after they left it. In Arcadia the first king was Pelasgus (Pausan. 8. 1. 4).' The evidence which connects the Pelasgian name with Argos is particularly strong, and is difficult to account for as due merely to a mistaken interpretation of Homer's Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος (B 681): see nn. on Eur. *Hclid.* 316, *Phoen.* 107. Aeschylus in the *Danaides* (fr. 46) traces the Pelasgians to the neighbourhood of Mycenae, and in the *Supplices* (257 ff.) Pelasgus is the king of Argos after whom the inhabitants are named Pelasgi. See Ridgeway, *Early Age of Greece*, pp. 90, 94. It is impossible within the limits of a note to summarize recent speculation concerning the Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians, and the relations of both to the Etruscans. Those who identify Pelasgi and Tyrseni explain the latter name as a descriptive epithet referring to the towers with which they protected their settlements (Murray, *Rise of Greek Epic*, p. 41). Ridgeway,

on the other hand, regards Tyrrhenian Pelasgians as those Pelasgians who having lived with the Tyrrhenians (Etruscans) had been more or less influenced by them (*l. c.* p. 146). Skutsch (in Pauly-Wissowa VI 730 ff.) considers the identity of the Tyrseni and Etrusci to be established beyond dispute, and that the latter reached Italy from the East by sea; but he also denies that they have any connexion with the Pelasgians, holding that they were a non-Greek seafaring folk, who occupied settlements on the islands and the coasts of the mainland. See also Holm, *Greek History*, Eng. tr. I p. 60 f., who accepts the view that the importance of the Pelasgians has been much exaggerated, and that their influence was confined to Epirus and Thessaly. J. L. Myres in *JHS* XXVII 215 traces the application of the name Pelasgian to Peloponnesian Argos to a misinterpretation of the Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος of Homer. Further, inasmuch as the names Pelasgian and Tyrrhenian were recognized in the fifth century as somehow or other connected (Thuc. *l.c.*), the latter in close association with the former acquired a general connotative sense of 'pre-Hellenic in the Aegean.'

271

. . . . . ῥεῖ γὰρ ἀπ' ἄκρας
Πίνδου Λάκμου τ' ἀπὸ Περραιβῶν
εἰς Ἀμφιλόχους καὶ Ἀκαρνᾶνας,

271 Strabo 271, after speaking of the legend which identified the Syracusan Arethusa with the Alpheus, continues: *τά γε προειρημένα ἀδύνατα καὶ τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου μύθῳ παραπλήσια· 'ῥεῖ Πίνδου' φησὶν ὁ Σοφοκλῆς 'Λάκμου...Ἀχελῴου' καὶ ὑποβάς 'ἔνθεν...Αυρκείου.' βελτίων δ' Ἑκαταῖος* (fr. 72, *FHG* I 5), *ὅς φησι τὸν ἐν τοῖς Ἀμφιλόχοις Ἴναχον ἐκ τοῦ Λάκμου λέοντα, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ Αἴας ῥεῖ, ἕτερον εἶναι τοῦ Ἀργολικοῦ.*

J. writes: 'The river Inachus in Epeirus is here fabled to be identical with the Inachus of Argolis, being connected with it by a submarine (and subterranean) channel. (1) The Epeirot Inachus rises "from the (northern) extremity of Pindus, and Lacmos." Mt *Lacmos*, or Lacmon, the great watershed of northern Greece, is in the NE. of Epeirus. It is a link between the Cambynian mountains on the E., and *Pindus* on the S. "Lacmon," probably = "rifted," being akin to λάκκος, "a hollow," and λακίς, "a rent" (Tozer, p. 52), referring to the deep valleys which cleave the range.

The Inachus rises in Lacmon; and its valley runs south, roughly parallel with Pindus. It flows through the highland country of the *Perrhaebi*—an Epeirot branch of the tribe who gave the name of Perrhaebia to a district of Hestiaeotis in N. Thessaly. It skirts the territory of the *Amphilochian Argos*, at the E. end of the Ambracian Gulf, sending out branches, on one of which stood the town of Argos, and then, near the NE. border of *Acarnania*, it flows into the Achelöus, which, rising, like the Inachus, in Lacmon, divides Acarnania on the W. from Aetolia on the E., and flows into the sea at the SW. extremity of Acarnania, near Oeniadae. [For Achelöus, see on *Tr.* 9.]

(2) The Argive Inachus rises in the highlands between Argolis and Arcadia, one part of which was called Artemision, and another Lyrceion. It flows through the district belonging to the town of Lyrceia (about seven miles NW. of Argos), which is fittingly named in the text as being the *first* place of note in Argolis traversed by the river.'

2 ἀπό does not suffer anastrophe (Chandler, § 916). **Περραιβῶν** is partitive genitive after **Λάκμου**: 'and from Lacmos in the Perrhaebi.' In prose the article would be required with **Περραιβῶν**: Kuehner-Gerth I 338.

3 Ἀμφιλόχους. The name is traced to Amphilochus, son of Amphiaraus and brother of Alcmaeon. Thucydides (2. 68) refers the foundation of this Western Argos to Amphilochus after his return from Troy; but Ephorus (*FHG* I 240) said that it was founded by Alcmaeon after the expedition of the Epigoni, and named after his brother, and that the river which flows through the country into the Ambracian gulf was called Inachus at the same time (Strabo 325). This is the branch mentioned above.

μίσγει δ' ὕδασιν τοῖς Ἀχελῴου

. . . . . .

ἔνθεν ἐς Ἄργος διὰ κῦμα τεμὼν 5
ἥκει δῆμον τὸν Λυρκείου.

271. 5 ἐνθένδ' *eis* (*ès*) codd. Hesych. III p. 57

4 μίσγει is intransitive, for it is very improbable that *ῥοάς* or the like occurred in the following verse, which Strabo omits. It is, then, another instance of the tendency shown by Greek verbs expressing motion to become intransitive: see n. on Eur. *Hel.* 1325 *ῥίπτει δ' ἐν πένθει | πέτρινα κατὰ δρία πολυνιφέα*. Add πάλλω (Eur. *El.* 435 etc.), ἐμβάλλω, ἰάπτω (Aesch. *Suppl.* 556); and for Latin examples see Munro on Lucr. 3. 502.— Blomfield, reading *καὶ <γῆν> ὑποβάς*, made the quotation from Soph. continuous, but *ὑποβάς* clearly belongs to Strabo.

5 διὰ κῦμα τεμών: for the tmesis see on fr. 799, 6.

6 Λυρκείου. The hero's name was Lyrcus, and he is described either as a son of Abas (Pausan. 2. 25. 5), or of Lynceus (Hesych. *s.v. Λυρκίου δῆμον*). There is another Lyrcus also connected with Argos, and mentioned in Parthen. 1, where he is called son of Phoroneus. Pausanias *l.c.* calls the place Lyrceia, and says that it was deserted as early as the time of the Trojan expedition; hence J. would prefer the adjective *Λύρκειον* here. But the name *Λύρκειον* is supported by Hesychius and Strabo (376), both of whom state that the township and the mountain were called by the same name. No doubt *Λύρκειον* was strictly the name of the mountain, and the site of the village having no separate name was known as *δῆμος Λυρκείου* or *ἡ Λυρκεία*.— J. quotes Aesch. fr. 196 *ἥξεις δῆμον ἐνδικώτατον...Γαβίους*.

272

γυνὴ τίς ἥδε συληνας Ἀρκάδος κυνῆ

272 *συληνας* (*συληνᾶς* VN)R, *κυληνᾶς* Ald., alii alia | *κυνῆς* Toup

272 Schol. Ar. *Av.* 1203 *κυνῆ δὲ ὅτι ἔχει περικεφαλαίαν τὸν πέτασον ὡς ὁ Ἑρμῆς ἄγγελος ὢν παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἰνάχῳ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰριδος* (so R as reported by Rutherford, but other edd. attribute the addition of *ἐπί* to Aldus)· *'γυνὴ... κυνῆ.'* (R is illegible after Ἀρκάδος.) It is evident that this is the passage referred to by Hesych. 1 p. 282 *Ἀρκὰς κυνῆ· Ἀρκαδικὸς πῖλος. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχῳ*, as restored by Scaliger for *ἀρκασκύνη· ἀρκαδικὸς πινός* from Eustath. *Il.* p. 302, 27 *ἐν τοῖς Παυσανίου* (fr. 72 Schwabe) *φέρεται ὅτι Ἀρκὰς κυνῆ ἐλέγετό τις ἤτοι Ἀρκαδικὸς πῖλος, διὰ τὸ ἔχειν ὡς εἰκός τι διάφορον πρὸς τὰ ὁμοειδῆ*. Hence Soping corrected Hesych. 1 p. 270 *ἀρασύνη· πύελος* to *Ἀρκὰς κυνῆ· πῖλος*.

It is to be feared that this cryptic utterance cannot be restored in the present state of the evidence. Brunck and Dindorf accept Toup's *κυκλὰς Ἀρκάδος κυνῆς*, which may be taken in two ways: (1) *κυκλάς* may be substantival with the sense of 'brim' (so Toup): 'there's a round Arcadian hat.' (2) *κυκλάς* may be an adjective, = 'encompassed' or 'covered.' Neither supposition is quite satisfactory. Nauck prints *γυνὴ τίς ἥδε γυμνάς; Ἀρκάδος κυνῆ* from his own conjecture, which I do not understand; but there is something to be said for his remark that *Ἀρκάδος κυνῆ* ought rather to be *Ἀρκὰς ἡ κυνῆ*. F. W. Schmidt proposed *γυνὴ τίς ἥδ'; οὐχ Ἑλλάς*; or *γυνή τις ἥδ' οὐχ Ἑλλάς*; against the evidence of the scholiast. R. Ellis conjectured *γυνὴ τίς; ἡ Κυλληνὶς Ἀρκάδος κυνῆ; Κυλληνίς* is an attractive suggestion, but no reading will be satisfactory which does not put *Ἀρκάς* (or *Ἀρκάδος*) in agreement with *κυνῆ* (or *κυνῆς*). That is demanded by the gloss of Hesychius, and is an essential condition of the problem. Blaydes conj. *στεγανὸς Ἀρκάδος κυνῆς*. Further, it may be inferred from Ar. *Av.* 1205 *ὄνομα δέ σοι τί*

ἐστι; πλοῖον ἢ κυνῆ; and from the interpretation of the scholiast that both in Sophocles and in Aristophanes Iris appeared on the stage in a broad-brimmed hat, similar to that worn by Ismene in *O. C.* 313 κρατὶ δ' ἡλιοστερὴς | κυνῆ πρόσωπα Θεσσαλίς νιν ἀμπέχει. Such a head-gear, a travelling hat for a journey, would be appropriate to Iris in her capacity of messenger, being a variety of the πέτασος which was worn by Hermes: see Guhl and Koner, p. 171. If we might assume that γυνή was no part of the original text, it would be possible to read τίς ἥδε συλήσασά μ' Ἀρκάδος κυνῆς; as if Hermes resented the appropriation of his own emblem. For the connexion of Hermes with Arcadia see Hom. *h. Herm.* 2 etc. M. Mayer in Roscher II 346 thinks that the schol. was altogether wrong in referring to the πέτασος, and that a high-crowned hat with side-flaps is meant (Hesych.'s πῖλος is right). But he goes farther, and supposes that Ἴριδος was an error for Ἰοῦς, and that Hermes alluded to the horns growing from Io's head: so he would introduce σελήνη or σεληνίς, but failed to fit it to the verse. Rutherford emended as follows: γυνὴ τίς ἥδε; <.....τίς εἶ> σύ; ληνὶς Ἀρκὰς ἢ κυνῆ; 'who are you? An Arcadian Bacchante or a sun hat?' He held that γυνὴ τίς ἥδε belonged to a separate line, and that the note originally referred to vv. 1199–1203. For ληνίς he quotes Suid. ληνίς, ληνίδος. ἡ βάκχη· παρὰ τὸν ληνόν. Hesych. III p. 35 ληναί· βάκχαι. Ἀρκάδες. *Etym. M.* p. 564, 4 ληνίς· σημαίνει τὴν βάκχην. He is thus able to take Ἀρκάς with both substantives. ληνίς is certainly ingenious, but the supposed lacuna and the explanatory addition of the adjective are less satisfactory. It is also difficult to appreciate the resemblance supposed to exist between ληνίς and κυνῆ.

273

Πλούτωνος ἥδ' ἐπείσοδος

273 ἥδ' Porson: δ' codd.

273 Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 727 τὸν Πλοῦτον Πλούτωνα εἶπε παίζων· ἢ ὅτι καὶ Πλούτωνα αὐτὸν ὑποκοριστικῶς ἐκάλεσεν (Nauck conj. ἐκάλουν, but the scholiastic ἢ ὅτι is simply attached to Πλούτωνα, and the subject to ἐκάλεσεν is the speaker), ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχῳ 'Πλούτωνος δ' ἐπείσοδος·' καὶ πάλιν 'τοιόνδ'...χάριν' (fr. 283).

Pluton is here introduced simply as the bestower of wealth (a by-form of Πλοῦτος), and the allusion is to the coming of Zeus. For the form see Usener, *Götternamen*, p. 16, who compares Ζάν: Ζεύς and Ποσειδῶν: Ποτιδᾶς. Zeus is thus the giver of wealth: cf. Suid. *s.v.* Ζεὺς κτήσιος· ὃν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ταμιείοις ἱδρύοντο ὡς πλουτοδότην. Pluton is to be regarded rather as the attendant minister of Zeus, than as a title applied to him. The cult of Plutus-Pluton was particularly associated with that of Demeter at Eleusis: Farnell, III pp. 137, 281.

The giving of the name Pluton to Hades is euphemistic (cf. Plat. *Crat.* 403 A καὶ φοβούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα [ω. Ἅιδης] Πλούτωνα καλοῦσιν αὐτόν), and comparatively late (no earlier instance than *Ant.* 1200 is quoted); and even when so applied the consciousness of its real signification remained (Ar. fr. 488, I 517 K. καὶ μὴν πόθεν Πλούτων γ' ἂν ὠνομάζετο, | εἰ μὴ τὰ βέλτιστ' ἔλαχεν). Whether the transference was made in view of the wealth stored beneath the earth (Cic. *n.d.* 2. 66 *terrena autem vis omnis atque natura Diti patri dedicata est, qui Dives, ut apud Graecos* Πλούτων, *quia et recidunt omnia in terras et oriuntur e terris.* Plat. *l.c.* τὸ δὲ Πλούτωνος, τοῦτο μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πλούτου δόσιν, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς κάτωθεν ἀνίεται ὁ Πλοῦτος, ἐπωνομάσθη. Lucian *Tim.* 21, where Plutus is speaking: ὁ Πλούτων ἀποστέλλει με παρ' αὐτούς, ἅτε πλουτοδότης καὶ μεγαλόδωρος καὶ αὐτὸς ὤν· δηλοῖ γοῦν καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι), or whether it was ironically applied to the god who, notwithstanding the extent of his power (Cornut. 5 καὶ Πλούτων δὲ ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸ πάντων φθαρτῶν ὄντων μηδὲν εἶναι ὃ μὴ τελευταῖον εἰς αὐτὸν κατατάττεται καὶ αὐτοῦ κτῆμα γίνεται), is only the lord of unsubstantial shadows (cf. *O.T.* 30, with Jebb's n.), cannot be determined. Birt's derivation (*Archiv f. lat. Lexicogr.* xi 165) from πλουτέων, 'the place of the majority,' is improbable. But Plutus and Pluton soon became completely differentiated, and the name Pluton as the wealth-giver failed to survive as an

independent personification. The earlier freedom is illustrated by Aesch. *Prom.* 831 *οἳ χρυσόρρυτον | οἰκοῦσιν ἀμφὶ νᾶμα Πλούτωνος πόρον*. It is in relation to the gold-mines of Spain that Strabo 147 quotes a remarkable passage of Posidonius: *οὐ πλουσία μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπόπλουτος ἦν, φησίν, ἡ χώρα· καὶ παρ' ἐκείνοις ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸν ὑποχθόνιον τόπον οὐχ ὁ Ἅιδης ἀλλ' ὁ Πλούτων κατοικεῖ*. And he goes on to say that in the Attic mines men work so zealously, *ὡς ἂν προσδοκώντων αὐτὸν ἀνάξειν τὸν Πλούτωνα*—to bring the wealth-god himself to the surface.

H. quotes from the lines on the *εἰρεσιώνη* attributed to Homer (v. 3) *αὐταὶ ἀνακλίνεσθε θύραι· πλοῦτος γὰρ ἔσεισιν | πολλός* (Suid. *s.v.* Ὅμηρος, [Hdt.] *vit. Hom.* 33).

Blaydes would prefer *ἦδ' ἔστ' εἴσοδος*, comparing fr. 275.

274

πανδόκος ξενόστασις

274 Pollux 9. 50 *μέρη δὲ πόλεως καὶ πανδοκεῖον καὶ ξενὼν καὶ ὡς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ Σοφοκλῆς, πανδόκος ξενόστασις*.

These words are simply the tragic periphrasis for an *inn*, and the anachronism is noteworthy. Cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 657 *ὥρα δ' ἐμπόρους μεθιέναι | ἄγκυραν ἐν δόμοισι πανδόκοις ξένων*, *ib.* 708 *ἄγ' αὐτὸν εἰς ἀνδρῶνας εὐξένους δόμων*. In *O.C.* 90 *ξενόστασις* = *shelter*.

275

[*τοῦ Διὸς εἰσελθόντος πάντα μεστὰ ἀγαθῶν ἐγένετο.*]

275 Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 807 *σιπύη ἡ ἀρτοθήκη· ταῦτα δὲ παρὰ τὰ (πρὸς τῷ [τὸ]V) ἐν Ἰνάχῳ Σοφοκλέους, ὅτε (ὅτι V) τοῦ Διὸς εἰσελθόντος πάντα μεστὰ ἀγαθῶν ἐγένετο*. Ar. *Plut.* 806 f. are as follows: *ἡ μὲν σιπύη μεστή 'στι λευκῶν ἀλφίτων, | οἱ δ' ἀμφορῆς οἴνου μέλανος ἀνθοσμίου*.

The word *παρά* is used in scholia much in the same way as a modern commentator would say 'compare (*confer*).' Thus it is employed as well when it is desired to illustrate a single phrase (schol. Aesch. *Prom.* 7, comparing Hom. I 212), as when two longer passages are compared (schol. Soph. *El.* 95, comparing Hom. λ 408 ff.). Here there is a comparison of the whole description in the two plays (cf. fr. 273); but we need not infer that Aristophanes was closely imitating or parodying the language of Sophocles. Blaydes conj. *Πλούτου* for *Διός* referring to fr. 273, but Pluton was introduced in the course of the description of the wealth which followed the coming of Zeus.

276

σιροὶ κριθῶν

276 Schol. Demosth. p. 182, 17 (on 8. 45) *σιροῖς*] *τὰ κατάγεια, Θεόπομπος καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ 'σιροὶ κριθῶν.'*

σιροί, underground pits used for the storage of grain and fodder (*ὀρύγματα, ἐν οἷς κατετίθετο τὰ σπέρματα* Phot., Suid.). Hencé Spanish *silo* (through Lat. *sirus*) and our *ensilage*. Bent, *Cyclades*, p. 454 f. refers to the practice as still prevailing in the island of Ceos: see also Sandys on Dem. *l.c.* Ammonius ap. *Etym. M.* p. 714, 20 testifies that the ι was short in Attic; and his statement is confirmed by Eur. fr. 827 *καὶ μὴν ἀνοῖξαι μὲν σιροὺς οὐκ ἠξίου*, and by Anaxandrides fr. 40, 27 (II 152 K.) *κέρχνων τε χύτραν, | βολβῶν τε σιρὸν δωδεκάπηχυν, | καὶ πουλυπόδων ἑκατόμβην*.

277

ξανθὴ δ' Ἀφροδισία λάταξ
πᾶσιν ἐπεκτύπει δόμοις.

277. **2** *παισὶν ἐπεκύπτει* codd.: corr. Heath (*πᾶσιν*) et Nauck[1], *ἐπικτυπεῖ* Meineke

277 Athen. 668 B *τῶν ἐρωμένων ἐμέμνηντο, ἀφιέντες ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τοὺς λεγομένους κοσσάβους. διὸ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ Ἀφροδισίαν εἴρηκε τὴν λάταγα· 'ξανθὴ... δόμοις.'*

The chief authorities for the game cottabus are Athen. 665 E—668 F, schol. Lucian *Lexiph.* 3, schol. Ar. *Pac.* 343 (= Suidas *s.v.* *κοτταβίζειν*), schol. Ar. *Pac.* 1242, 1244. From these it appears that the members of the *συμπόσιον* were accustomed to regard the game as a love-oracle, and that the successful player, whether his success was measured by the clearness of the sound proceeding from the splash of the falling wine itself, or from the clatter of the *πλάστιγξ* descending upon the head of the *μάνης* (fr. 537), by the retention of all the wine in the *πλάστιγξ*, or by the sinking of the largest number of *ὀξύβαφα*, was secure in the affections of his *ἐρωμένη*. Hence the epithet *Ἀφροδισία*.—**λάταξ** is obviously used of the drops of wine thrown by the players, not, as L. and S. appear to imply, of the game itself. Athenaeus cites in the same connexion Eur. fr. 631 *πολὺς δὲ κοσσάβων ἀραγμὸς | Κύπριδος προσῳδὸν ἀχεῖ | μέλος ἐν δόμοισιν*, and Callim. fr. 102 *πολλοὶ καὶ φιλέοντες Ἀκόντιον ἦκαν ἔραζε | οἰνοπόται Σικελὰς ἐκ κυλίκων λάταγας.*—**ξανθή** describes the *red* glow of the wine, as it sparkles in the light. But the poet was not thinking of red wine, as contrasted with white; still less could the word signify a light-coloured (yellow) wine, in comparison with a darker shade. That *ξανθός* in certain respects answers to our use of *red* may be deduced not only from Antipater of Sidon's *ξανθὸν ἐρεύθεται* (*A.P.* 12. 97) of a handsome boy, but also from its application to horses, lions, and oxen, and especially to fire (this is the point of Pindar fr. 122 *αἴτε τᾶς χλωρᾶς λιβάνου ξανθὰ δάκρυα | θυμιᾶτε*, and fr. 79[b] *αἰθομένα δὲ δᾷς ὑπὸ ξανθαῖσι πεύκαις*). When Simonides applies it to honey (fr. 47), he is thinking rather of the brightness than of the actual colour of the liquid.—**ἐπεκτύπει**: see cr. n. H. points out that a similar error *συνκύπτωι* for *σὺν κτύπῳ* occurs in Aesch. *Cho.* 23.

Meineke inferred that the passage formed part of a description of general festivity, and of the joys consequent upon a state of peace. His reading *ἐπικτυπεῖ* was intended to balance *βρίθει* in fr. 286, which he believed to belong to the same context. He well points out that the converse case—the abandonment of the festive sport on an outbreak of war—is described in a fragment of Hermippus (fr. 47, 1 237 K.): *ῥάβδον δ' ὄψει τὴν κοτταβικὴν | ἐν τοῖς ἀχύροισι κυλινδομένην, | μανὴς δ' οὐδὲν λατάγων ἀίει κτέ.*—For the metre of the first line see *Ai.* 399, *O.C.* 210.

278

εὐδαίμονες οἱ τότε γέννας
ἀφθίτου λαχόντες [θείου]

278. **1** *γέννας* Bergk: *γενεᾶς* codd. **2** *θείου* del. Herwerden

278 Schol. V Ar. *Pac.* 531 *Σοφοκλέους μελῶν] ὅτι ἡδέα τὰ μέλη Σοφοκλέους· περιέργως δὲ τινὲς εἰς τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἰνάχῳ περὶ τοῦ ἀρχαίου βίου καὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας· 'εὐδαίμονες ... θείου.'* The first line is also quoted by Philodem. *de piet.* p. 51 G *<τῆς ἐπ>ὶ Κρόνου ζω<ῆς εὐ>δαιμονεστά<της οὔσ>ης, ὡς ἔγραψ<αν Ἡσί>οδος καὶ ὁ τὴν <Ἀλκμ>εωνίδα ποή<σας καὶ> Σοφοκλῆς <εὐδαίμο>νες οἱ τότε <γέννας> εἰπών.*

The allusion is to a belief in a Golden

Age, when mankind lived in a state of primitive simplicity and happiness under the rule of Cronos: see Plat. *polit.* 269 A, Cratin. Πλοῦτοι fr. 165 (I. 64 K.) οἷς δὴ βασιλεὺς Κρόνος ἦν τὸ παλαιόν, | ὅτε τοῖς ἄρτοις ἠστραγάλιζον κτέ., whence Vergil's *redeunt Saturnia regna*. The chief literary authority for the fable was Hes. *Op.* 111—122, from which it appears that **ἀφθίτου** does not imply immortality, but freedom from pain and decay: οἳ μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν, ὅτ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασίλευεν· | ὥστε θεοὶ δ' ἔζωον ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, | νόσφιν ἄτερ τε πόνων καὶ ὀϊζύος· οὐδέ τι δειλὸν | γῆρας ἐπῆν...θνῆσκον δ' ὡς ὕπνῳ δεδμημένοι (116), and after death they became δαίμονες ἐσθλοί, guardians of mortal men (122).

1f. γένυας: for the gen. after λαγχάνω cf. *O.C.* 450 ἀλλ' οὔ τι μὴ λάχωσι τοῦδε συμμάχου. Blaydes would read τυχόντες.—It is clear that something is wrong with θείου, not merely in respect of its gender, but also because the metre unaccountably halts. Bergk read ἀφθίτου θείας λαχόντες with dactylo-epitritic rhythm; but in denying that an ithyphallic occurs after an enhoplius, except at the conclusion of a system, he was in error, as appears from *O.T.* 196 f., where the scansion is: – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –. See Nauck in *Jahrb. f. Philol.* CV 803 ff. The rhythm of *Trach.* 960 f. is similar, but those lines form the close of a strophe. Tucker (*C.R.* XVIII 245) suggested ἀφθίτου λαχόντες αἰοῦς, taking γένυας as a causal genitive with εὐδαίμονες. This is metrically unexceptionable, and is exactly parallel to *Trach.* 822 f., but it is somewhat hazardous to introduce the unexampled αἰοῦς by way of conjecture. On the whole, it seems safest simply to delete θείου with Herwerden; for, though it can hardly have been a gloss, the word may have been attached to the quotation accidentally. It is perhaps worth mentioning that the scholiast continues with θέασαι. If λαχόντες is retained, Blaydes suggests αἶσαν for θείου.—The language resembles Ar. *Nub.* 1028 εὐδαίμονες δ' ἦσαν ἄρ' οἱ | ζῶντες τότ' ἐπὶ τῶν προτέρων.

279

τραχὺς χελώνης κέρχνος ἐξανίσταται.

279 τραχὺς ᾧ codd.: corr. Elmsley

279 Erotian. *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 81, 16 παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς κερχνώδη ἀγγεῖα λέγεται τὰ τραχείας ἀνωμαλίας ἔχοντα, ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς περὶ τῆς ἀποταυρουμένης φησὶν Ἰοῦς (so Elmsley for ἰχθῦς) 'τραχὺς... ἐξανίσταται.'

For **χελώνης** M. Schmidt conjectured κορώνης, and Wecklein χελύνης; and Herwerden recast the line as τραχὺς δὲ φωνῆς κέρχνος ἐξανίεται. Mekler understands: 'a harsh croaking resounds from the lyre.' For this sense of κέρχνος cf. fr. 314, 128. But the text aptly describes the growth of the cow's horns on the maiden's brow, and the suspicion directed against χελώνης appears to be unwarranted. Cf. Philostr. *vit. Apoll.* I. 19. The genitive is descriptive—rough *as* a tortoise: cf. *Ant.* 114 λευκῆς χιόνος πτέρυγι στεγανός, where the schol. is: λείπει δὲ τὸ ὡς ἵν' ᾖ ὡς χιόνος. This explains the origin of the MS reading: ᾧ was actually ὡς, an explanatory adscript, and ὡς is itself found as a correction in cod. D (Paris. 2177). For the confusion of ᾧ and ὡς cf. *e.g.* Pollux 2. 172. [Headlam, making the same suggestion (*J.P.* XXXI 9), quotes examples of ὡς from schol. Aesch. *Eum.* 159, *Theb.* 820.]

κέρχνος is any kind of hard excrescence rising from a smooth surface. Phot. *s.v.* explains τραχύ τι ἐν τοῖς ἑνωτίοις ('qu. μετώποις' H.). See Hesych. II p. 470 *s.vv.* κερχνῶσαι and κέρχνωμα: for ἀσπίδων κερχνώμασιν in Eur. *Phoen.* 1386 see note *in loc.* So κερχνωτά (Hesych.) are cups with embossed lips, *cymbia...aspera signis* (Verg. *Aen.* 5. 267), *inaequales berullo phialas* (Juv. 5. 38). Add Hesych. II p. 469 κέρχανα ἢ κερχάνεα· ὀστέα, καὶ ῥίζαι ὀδόντων ('stumps'). The horns of Io are always a prominent feature in the legend: Aesch. *Prom.* 613 τᾶς βούκερω παρθένου, Prop. I. 3. 20 *ignotis cornibus Inachidos*, Ov. *Met.* I. 652. R. Ellis (*Hermath.* IX 153) also defends χελώνης, which he understands as a reference to the roughness of the tortoise's corrugated and puckered skin. But the cow's hide would not have been described as κέρχνος, and χελώνης must have suggested the shell rather than the skin of the tortoise: cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1292.

280

βοῦ

280 *Antiatt.* (Bekk. *anecd.*) p. 84, 18 βοῦ· ἀντὶ τοῦ βοός. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχῳ. Choerob. *in Theod.* p. 237, 8 [= 234, 36 Hilgard] εὑρέθη τοῦ βοῦς ἡ γενικὴ οὐ μόνον βοός, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ βοῦ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἰναχῳ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Αἰσχύλῳ (fr. 421). The same extract occurs in Herodian II 704, 39.

βοῦ is formed directly on the analogy of *νοῦ*, for *βοῦς* and *νοῦς* (from *νόος*) were pronounced with the same vowel sound (*ū*) in the fifth century. See Brugmann, *Gr. Gramm.*[3] p. 52; G. Meyer, *Gr. Gramm.*[3] § 322; Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 173.

281

[Ἄργος πανόπτης ἆδων βουκολεῖ τὴν Ἰώ.]

281 Schol. Ar. *Eccl.* 80 τοῦ πανόπτου] τοι τὴν Ἰὼ φυλάττοντος· αἰνίττεται δὲ ὡς ὄντος αὐτοῦ (*sc.* τοῦ Δαμίου) δεσμοφύλακος· ἀναφέρει δὲ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τον παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἰναχῳ Ἄργον. The lines of Aristophanes are: νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν σωτῆρ' ἐπιτηδειός γ' ἀνὴρ | τὴν τοῦ πανόπτου διφθέραν ἐνημμένος, | εἴπερ τις ἄλλος, βουκολεῖν τὸ δημιον (τὴν Δημιὰ conj. von Velsen). On v. 81 the schol. continues: βουκολεῖν δὲ ὡς τὴν Ἰὼ ὁ Ἄργος ἐν Ἰνάχῳ Σοφοκλέους. From this we should infer that Argus in the distinctive dress of a herdsman appeared to attend Io in the *Inachus*. In Aesch. *Prom.* 596 Io fancies she still hears the pipe of Argus: ὑπὸ δὲ κηρόπλαστοι ὀτοβεῖ δόναξ ἀχέτας ὑπνοδύτας νόμον, and the schol. remarks: Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ καὶ ᾄδοντα αὐτὸν εἰσάγει· εἰπὼν δὲ αὐτὸν 'βούταν' (v. 590) ἐνέμεινε τῇ τροπῇ· αὐλοῦσι γὰρ ἑπόμενοι τοῖς ποιμέσιν οἱ βουκόλοι. Thus Argus chanted an ode in Sophocles; but in Ov. *Met.* I. 676 ff. it was Hermes who with his shepherd's pipe lulled Argus to sleep.

282

ἐπήνεσ'· ἴσθι δ', ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία,
ἐκ κάρτα βαιῶν γνωτὸς ἂν γένοιτ' ἀνήρ.

282 Stob. *flor.* 46. 13 (IV p. 199, 6 Hense) Σοφοκλέους ἐν Ἰνάχῳ· 'ἐπήνεσ'... ἀνήρ.' The extract is given by S, but omitted by MA. The second line is quoted by Apostol. 6. 88*a* without the author's name.

We cannot discover the form in which the proverb was current, but its general character is reflected by such passages as Aesch. *Cho.* 261 ἀπὸ σμικροῦ δ' ἂν ἄρσας μέγαν | δόμον, or Ar. *Av.* 709 εἶτ' εἰ σὺ σὲ νοεῖς μεγάλα πράττει. The following proverbs are applied to the *parvenu*: Diogen. I. 94 ἀπὸ βραδυσκελῶν ὄνων ἵππα ὥρυσεν: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπὸ εὐτελῶν μέν, ἐνδόξων δὲ γενομένων ἐκείνων (ep. Zenob. 2. 3). Diogen. I. 98 ἀπὸ κώπης ἐπὶ βῆμα: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπὸ χειρώνων εἰς κρίττονα, commented with ἀνίπτοις ποσί by Syrian. *ad Hermog.* IV p. 40 Walz οἷος ἦν ὁ τε ἀπὸ τῆς κώπης ἀνίπτοις ποσὶ κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα πηδήσας Δημάδης. Cf. Isocr. 5. 89 συνέπεσεν ἐξ ἀδόξων μὲν γενέσθαι λαμπροῖς ἐκ πενήτων δὲ πλουσίοις, ἐκ ταπεινῶν δὲ πολλῆς χώρας καὶ πόλεων δεσπόταις. Dem. 18. 131 ἐλεύθερος ἐκ δούλου καὶ πλούσιος ἐκ πτωχοῦ διὰ τουτουσὶ γεγονώς. On the strength of such analogies Blaydes (on *O. T.* 454) proposed βαιοῦ in place of βαιῶν, and by his n. on *ibid.* 750 suggested that βαιῶν was masc. But there can be no doubt that it is neuter ('from small beginnings'): cf. *Phil.* 730 εὐθαίμων ἀνὸς σοι καὶ μέγας ἐκ κείνων.—**ἴσθι** is followed by an independent clause without ὅτι. Cf. Plat. *apol.* 20 D εὖ μέντοι ἴστε, πᾶσαν ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐρῶ. A collection of similar examples is given by Jacobs, *Animadv. in Athen.* [supplement to Schweighauser's ed.] 1809, p. 271.—**ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία** occurs in Aesch. *Ag.* 276, Eur. fr. 668.—**κάρτα**: qualifying the adj., as in *Trach.* 1218 εἰ καὶ μακρὰ κάρτ' ἐστίν, ἐργασθήσεται, but not so clearly in the other examples given by Ellendt *s.v.*—**γνωτός**: fr. 203.

283

τοιόνδ' ἐμὸν Πλούτων' ἀμεμφείας χάριν

283 ἀμεμφίας codd.

283 Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 727 is quoted on fr. 273.

In the absence of the context it does not seem worth while to throw suspicion on the text, although several scholars have condemned τοιόνδ' or ἐμόν or both. Thus Hemsterhuis conjectured τοιάνδ' ἐμοί, Fritzsche τοιόνδ' ἔχω, and Bergk τοιάνδ' ἐμοὶ Πλούτων—the last to the detriment of the caesura. But with such an addition as γεγὼτ' ἀπαιτεῖν the traditional words might stand. I have, however, restored ἀμεμφείας for ἀμεμφίας, which is a questionable form. ἀμεμφεία is required by the metre in Aesch. *Theb.* 893, and it is improbable that so rare a word would (like ἀμαθία, εὐτυχία, or προμηθία) follow the *-O*-stems. That the forms in *-ια* are due to Ionic influence is an error: see Weir Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, §§ 145, 215.—**ἀμεμφείας χάριν** may be rendered provisionally as 'meed of praise,' although it is equally possible that χάριν is a preposition. The use of ἀμεμφείας, where a word of positive import might have been expected, is characteristically Greek. Thus Menelaus, transported with joy at the recovery of Helen (Eur. *Hel.* 636): ὦ φιλτάτη πρόσοψις, οὐκ ἐμέμφθην. Other examples are quoted in the n. on Eur. *Phoen.* 425.

284

πατὴρ δὲ ποταμὸς Ἴναχος
τὸν ἀντίπλαστον νόμον ἔχει κεκμηκότων.

284. 2 ἔχει νόμον cod.: corr. Porson, νομὸν ἔχει Ellendt

284 Hesych. I p. 214 ἀντίπλαστον. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχῳ 'πατὴρ...κεκμηκότων,' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰσόπλαστον, ὅμοιον.

J. writes: '(1) Ellendt (*s.v.* κάμνω) understands, *similem inferis sedem* (νομὸν) *habere*. "Inachus has a province (or realm) similar to that of the dead." ἀντίπλαστον (τῶν) κεκμηκότων = τοῦ τῶν κεκμ. (like ὅμοιος with gen.). This might refer to the passage of Inachus under the earth from Acarnania to Argolis (fr. 271). (2) With νόμον we might explain: "Inachus has a customary tribute like that paid to the dead": cp. Aesch. *Cho.* 6 πλόκαμον Ἰνάχῳ θρεπτήριον, [τὸν δεύτερον δὲ τόνδε πενθητήριον—where the same comparison between the mourning lock and the nurture lock is involved, as also in *Il.* Ψ 141 f.;] and for offerings of *hair* to the dead, see on *Ai.* 1173 ff.' Wilamowitz understands a reference to the parched condition of Inachus in consequence of Hera's wrath ('Inachos selbst ward fast zu einer trocknen Mumie'): see Introductory Note. Tucker (*C.R.* XVII 190) proposed to read τόδ' ἀντίπλαστον ὄνομ' ἔχει, *i.e.* 'has this name (peculiarly) constructed to signify weariness'—as if the name were derived from ἶνες and ἄχος. In reference to this conjecture it should be observed that Inachus was traditionally connected with the proverbial Ἰνοῦς ἄχη, a view which is favoured by some modern authorities (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 134713). Fick connected the word with the Hesychian gloss ἰνάσαι· καταχέαι, and χέω, and others have thought that it contained the root of *aqua* (cf. Achelous, Acheron): so Waser in Pauly-Wissowa VI 2791.

ἀντίπλαστος resembles in its formation ἀντίγραφος, ἀνταμοιβός, and ἀντίμμος (explained as = ὅμοιος by the schol. on Ar. *Thesm.* 17).

285

ναρὰς χυτρίνων ἐκροὰς ἐπώμοσα.

285 καὶ σασχυτρύνων cod.: corr. Lehrs (ναράς) et Stadtmueller (χυτρίνων)

285 Herodian περὶ μον. λέξ. p. 35, 9 (II p. 940 Lentz) τὰ γὰρ εἰς ρος δισύλλαβα, τῷ ᾰ παραληγόμενα, ὀξυνόμενα μὲν ἔχει ἐκτεινόμενον τὸ ᾱ, ψαρός, λαρός· ἔνθεν θηλυκὸν παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἰνάχῳ· καὶ σασχυτρύνων (so Egenolff reports: the edd. give σασχυτρίνων) λάρος εὖτ' ἐπὶ κῦμα ἐκ ροὰς ἐπώμοσα λάρος ἀνήρ. ἔνθεν τὸ οὐδέτερον, 'λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον' (μ 283). βαρυνόμενα δέ, εἰ καὶ ἀρσενικὰ ὑπάρχοι ἢ θηλυκά, συστέλλειν θέλει τὸ ᾱ, 'λάρῳ ὁρνιθι ἐοικώς' (ε 51).

The puzzle is to extract from this the words of Sophocles. Dindorf conjectured that καὶ σασχυτρίνων was a corruption of σατυρικῷ, and this was accepted by Lehrs, who altering λαρός after ψαρός to ναρός held that λαρός was not introduced until the words λάρος ἀνήρ, and converted the latter to λαρὸς ἁμής. The intervening words λάρος...ἐπώμοσα form the quotation from Sophocles; and were restored by Lehrs as ναρὰς τε πατρὸς κυμάτων ἐπιρροὰς ἐπώμοσα. Few will approve Schneider's modification (*Callim.* II 756): 'Ἰὼ δὲ ναροὶς εἰτ' ἐπὶ κύμασιν ῥοὰς | ἐπώμοσα. Both conjectures are a long way from the traditional text, but the introduction of ναρός (see on fr. 621) is an attractive suggestion. H. writes: 'The proposition which Herodian is supporting is that *when disyllables in* ᾱρος are accented oxytone, the ᾰ is long; whereas, when they are paroxytone, the ᾰ is usually short. And the Homeric examples bear this out: for in the one case the complete line is νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον; whereas the complete line in the other case is σεύατ' ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ κῦμα λάρῳ ὁρνιθι ἐοικώς. Now, it appears to me that the latter part of λαροσεύατ' ἐπὶ κῦμα is merely a corruption of σεύατ' ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ κῦμα, jotted down by some reader in the margin and afterwards transcribed in the wrong place. Supposing this to be so, we are left with παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἰνάχῳ καὶ σασχυτρύνων λαρο.. ἐκροὰς ἐπώμοσα. The term χυτρῖνοι was applied sometimes to pot-like cavities in which springs rise, or pot-like holes in rivers; see Hesych. *s. vv.* χυτρῖνοι and λίθων χοαί, Antig. *mirab.* 176, Arrian 1 p. 291 Mueller, which are all quoted at full length in the *Thesaurus*. But we cannot read καὶ σὰς χυτρίνων ἐκροὰς ἐπώμοσα, because it does not illustrate Herodian's point. There was, however, this word, as well as the adjective χύτρινος, to account for a scribe writing χυτρίνων by error; and the error would be easy if, as I suggest, he found ΧΥΓΡΑΙΝΩΝ or ΧΥΓΡΥΝΩΝ, *i.e.* χ' ὑγραινῶν or χ' ὑγρύνων. My suggestion is that we have here two fragments,—one, ΚΑΙCΑΡΧΥΓΡΑΙΝΩΝ, that is, καὶ σάρχ' ὑγραίνων λαρὸν (cf. Eur. fr. 367), which just meets the case, giving both the long ᾱ and the feminine,—and another one which does the same, λαροὺς ἐκροὰς ἐπώμοσα. Whether both are from the *Inachus*, or only one, and if so, which, I shall not attempt to decide; but perhaps the first may have been the work of a later hand.' It will be observed that this suggestion had been partially anticipated by Stadtmueller, who, as reported by Egenolff in *Kh. Mus.* LVI 288, restored πᾶσαι χυτρίνων ἐκροὰς ἐπώμασεν | λαροὺς ἀνήρ, i.e. *omnes foraminum exitus clausit vir dulci imbutus sapore*, and cut out the words εὖτ' ἐπὶ κῦμα as interpolated from Hom. ε 51. He explained χυτρίνων by reference to the underground course of the Inachus (fr. 271, 5). The suggestion that εὖτ' ἐπὶ κῦμα is an interpolation deserves acceptance and with it might go λάρος (before εὖτ'). λαροὺς ἀνήρ (after ἐπώμοσα) probably has nothing to do with Sophocles. If, then, following Lehrs, we assume that ναρὸς has dropped out before ἔνθεν θηλυκὸν and substitute ναρὰς for καὶ σασ..., the result is the text, which, however doubtful, yields an appropriate sense.

286

πάντα δ' ἐρίθων ἀραχνᾶν βρίθει.

286 Suid. *s.v.* ἀράχνη (Bekk. *anecd.* p. 442, 5)...εἴρηται δὲ ἀράχνης καὶ παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ (*Op.* 777) καὶ παρὰ Πινδάρῳ (fr. 268) καὶ παρὰ Καλλίᾳ (II 694 K. καλλίοις in Bekk. *anecd.*: 'debebat παρὰ ἄλλοις' Nauck)...θηλυκῶς δὲ Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχῳ· 'πάντα...βρίθει.'

When the gear of war is covered with cobwebs, it is a sign of profound peace: the earliest extant expression of this sentiment is in Bacchyl. fr. 3, 6 J. ἐν δὲ σιδαροδέτοις πόρπαξιν αἰθᾶν | ἀραχνᾶν ἱστοὶ πέλονται. Cf. Eur. fr. 369 κείσθω δόρυ μοι μίτον | ἀμφιπλέκειν ἀράχναις. Theocr. 16. 96 ἀράχνια δ' εἰς ὅπλ' ἀράχναι | λέπτα διαστήσαιντο, Nonn. 38. 13 (quoted by Smyth) ἔκειτο δὲ τηλόθι χάρμης | Βακχιὰς ἐξαέτηρος ἀραχνιόωσα βοείη. Cf. Tibull. 1. 10. 50 *occupat in tenebris militis arma situs*. For English imitations see Smyth on Bacchyl. *l.c.*, Headlam, *Book of Greek Verse*, p. 276. Meineke, accordingly, substituted πέλτα for πάντα, and is followed by Nauck. But this is surely hazardous; for even granting that the reference is to warlike instruments, πάντα may have been explained by the preceding words. And the presence of the spiders' webs may equally well be a sign of decay in general. Cf. Hom. π 34 Ὀδυσσῆος δέ που εὐνὴ | κήτει ἐνευναίων κάκ' ἀράχνια κεῖται ἔχουσα, imitated by Prop. 3. 6. 33 *putris et in vacuo textur aranea lecto*. Indeed, if we connect the line with frs. 273, 275, 276, the words are entirely in point as describing the emptiness of the storehouses, which the sudden advent of Wealth will fill again: so Heș. *Op.* 475 ἐκ δ' ἀγγείων ἐλάσειας ἀράχνια, Afran. 410 *tamne arcula tua plena est aranearum*, Plaut. *Aul.* 84 *ita inaniis sunt oppletae* (sc. *aedes*) *atque araneis*, Catull. 13. 7 *tui Catulli plenus sacculus est aranearum*. Cratinus makes a ludicrous application of the idea: fr. 190 (II 71 K.) ἀραχνίων μεστὴν ἔχεις τὴν γαστέρα. It appears again in an elaborate description by Philostratus of a painting of a spider's web (*imag.* 2. 28. 1): οἰκίας μὲν οὐκ εὖ πραττούσης προπύλαια ταῦτα, φήσεις αὐτὴν χηρεύειν δεσποτῶν...ἀλλ' ἔστιν οἰκητὸς ἀράχναις μόναις· φιλεῖ γὰρ τὸ ζῷον ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ διαπλέκειν. And in the same passage is an imitation of Sophocles (§ 3): αἱ δ' ἔριθοι δι' αὐτῶν βαδίζουσι τείνουσαι τοὺς κεχαλασμένους τῶν μίτων.—Blaydes calls attention to the fact that βρίθω is usually accompanied by the dative. But he should not have conjectured βρύει: for Homer's authority (ι 219, etc.) is sufficient justification, apart from the analogy of the verbs with similar meaning.

287

ἐπίκρουμα χθονὸς Ἀργείας

287 Hesych. II p. 158 ἐπίκρουμα· ἐπίπληγμα ἢ ἐπιχάραγμα. διὰ τὸ παρωνομάσθαι τῷ ἔργῳ· 'ἐπίκρουμα...'Αργείας.' Σοφοκλῆς Ἰνάχῳ.

παρονομάζειν means 'to form a new word from one already existing.' This appears clearly from Dem. *de eloc.* 97 παρὰ τὰ κείμενα παρονομάζοντα αὐτόν, οἷον ὡς τὸν σκαφίτην τις ἔφη τὸν τὴν σκάφην ἐρέσσοντα, καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης τὸν αὐτίτην οἷον τὸν μόνον αὐτὸν ὄντα: see also Rutherford, *Annotation*, p. 239f3. For the dative cf. Plut. *de fort. Rom.* 5 p. 318 F τῇ τύχῃ τὴν ἀνδρείαν παρωνόμασεν, schol. Ar. *Plut.* 590 ὁ δὲ ἀνελεύθερος κακίᾳ παρωνόμασται τῇ ἀνελευθεριότητι. Hesych. asserts that ἐπίκρουμα is a new formation from ἐπικρούω, intended to express the action of striking. The words of S. mean therefore 'the beating of Argive earth' or possibly 'the solid ground that is struck.' Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 202 χθόνα βάκτροις ἐπικρούσαντας Ἀτρείδας. This is substantially the same as Ellendt's view, who thinks the reference is to striking with a stick or to dancing. Tucker, who takes the view that ἐπίκρουμα means *reproach*, prefers τῷ ἀργῷ: *i.e.* Ἄργος is supposed to be derived from ἀργός 'idle.' Bergk restored the text of Sophocles as ἐπίκρουμ' Ἄργον χθονὸς Ἀργείας, understanding ἐπίκρουμα as the impression of a coin.

He accepted Toup's Ἄργῳ for ἔργῳ (also approved by M. Schmidt) and supposed that the words διὰ τὸ.. Ἄργῳ originally followed the quotation as an explanation of Ἀργείας.

In view of Eur. *El.* 180 ἑλικτὸν κρούσω πόδ' ἐμόν, *I.A.* 1042 χρυσεοσάνδαλον ἴχνος ἐν γᾷ κρούουσαι, and perhaps of *Her.* 1304, it is open to doubt whether the traditional explanation of Ar. *Thesm.* 120 Λατώ τε κρούματά τ' Ἀσιάδος ποδὶ παράρυθμ' εὔρυθμα Φρυγίων | δινεύματα Χαρίτων is correct. If κρούματα are the beats of the foot in dancing, Ἀσιάδος would naturally mean the land of Asia; and the interpretation of the scholia might have been due to κίθαριν in the response of the chorus, which however was the usual accompaniment of the dancers. Cf. Pollux 7. 88.

288

κυαμόβολον δικαστήν

288 κυαμοβόλως δικιστήν cod.: corr. Musurus, κυαμόβολον (pro κυαμοβόλον) Brunck

288 Hesych. II p. 544 κνάμῳ πατρίῳ· Σοφοκλῆς Μελεάγρῳ (fr. 404), ὡς καὶ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν τὰς ἀρχὰς κυαμευόντων. διεκληροῦν δὲ αὐτὰς κνάμῳ καὶ ὁ τὸν (ὅταν cod.) λευκὸν λαβὼν ἐλάγχανεν. ἀνάγει δὲ τοὺς χρόνους, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰνάχῳ 'κυαμοβόλως δικιστήν' (κυαμοβόλῳ δικαστῇ Schow, κυαμοβολῶ σε δικαστήν, conj. Nauck).

The meaning of the words is not entirely free from doubt owing to the scantiness of our information respecting the method of appointing dicasts in the fifth century. It seems certain, however, that κυαμοβόλος cannot refer to the voting of the dicasts, as there is nothing, except the very questionable statement in the scholia to *Eq.* 41, to indicate that they ever recorded their votes by using beans; and the positive information touching χοινᾶναι (Ar. *Vesp.* 333, etc.) is definitely against any such hypothesis. We must therefore assume that κυαμοβόλος is right and refers to the appointment of dicasts by lot; and that at some time or other beans were used for the necessary balloting, as is well known to have been the case with the κληρωταὶ ἀρχαί (Gilbert, *Staatsalt.*[2] 1 p. 242$_2$). In order to check the increasing evil of bribery, the method of appointment was changed from time to time, and we know little or nothing about the system in vogue during the middle of the fifth century; thus the evidence of Ar. *Plut.* 277 as to balloting for a particular court only affects the period subsequent to Euclides. Arist. *Ath. pol.* 27. 4 seems to show that a yearly ballot was held for admission to the heliastic list of 6000, but by what method those who succeeded were afterwards subdivided into separate panels cannot be determined (Gilbert, p. 441f.; Lipsius, p. 136; Thalheim in Pauly-Wissowa v 567). Ar. *Eq.* 41 κυαμοτρώξ Δῆμος alludes to the use of beans in election to office, but its point is said to have been partly derived from the fact that the dicasts chewed beans when sitting in court in order to ward off sleep and keep their wits sharp (Ar. *Lys.* 537, 690 with the scholia). For the anachronism see *Av.* 1135, 1285 (Jebb's nn.).

289

χειμῶνι σὺν παλινσκίῳ

289 Hagnost. p. 143, 9 παλίσκιον... Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ· 'χειμῶνι σὺν παλινσκίῳ' ἀντὶ τοῦ ζοφερῷ. Phot. *lex.* p. 374, 11 and Suid. παλίνσκιον... καὶ Σοφοκλῆς 'χειμῶνι παλινσκίῳ.' Phot. *lex.* p. 373, 25 and Suid. παλινσκίῳ· σκοτεινῷ. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 294, 6 παλίσκιον· τὸ ὑποσκιαζόμενον ὑπ' ἄλλου.

The example is quoted by the lexicographers in order to show that πάλιν in composition is sometimes employed with intensive force (Hesych. III p. 261 παλίσκιος· σύσκιος, σκοτεινός, ζοφώδης· τὸ γὰρ πάλιν ἐπιτασιν δηλοῖ). Suidas refers to παλιγλάπηλος and παλίμπηκτος as parallel; but there the idea of repetition is prominent, as also in παλιμμήκης.— Naber needlessly conjectured λειμῶνι.

290

Γῆ μήτηρ θεῶν

290 Philodem. *de piet.* p. 23 καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐ<ν 'Ινά>χῳ τὴν γῆν μ<ητέ>ρα τῶν θεῶν φη<σίν>, ἐν Τριπτολέμ<ῳ δὲ> καὶ 'Εστίαν (fr. 615) εἶν<αι>.

According to the Hesiodic *Theogony* (v. 45) Gaia and Uranus are the parents of the gods, and this tradition is carried on in Hom. *h.* 30. 17 χαῖρε, θεῶν μήτηρ, ἄλοχ' Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος, Solon fr. 36. 2 μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων 'Ολυμπίων. Cf. Orph. *h.* 26. 1 Γαῖα θεά, μᾶτερ μακάρων, θνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων. In spite of some development of her cult at Athens, Ge never became a divine personality so distinct as to sway the hearts or imaginations of the Greeks: see Eitrem in Pauly-Wissowa VII 478. In *Phil.* 391 ὀρεστέρα παμβῶτι Γᾶ, μᾶτερ αὐτοῦ Διός, her identification with Rhea, who in Hes. *Theog.* 470 is her daughter, is implied. Cf. Chrysipp. II 1084, 1085 Arn. The introduction into Greece of the Phrygian cult of Rhea-Cybele, Mother of the Gods, is assigned to the fifth century: cf. Strabo 469 Ῥέαν μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τιμῶσι καὶ ὀργιάζουσι ταύτῃ, μητέρα καλοῦντες θεῶν. In Eur. *Hel.* 1302 Demeter is called the mother of the gods, and is clearly, as the sequel shows, identified with Cybele. On the other hand, Demeter has many affinities with Ge: for the evidence see Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1166. It should be added that, although the identification of the Mother of the Gods with Rhea-Cybele is extremely common, there is reason to believe that there was also an indigenous Greek cult, recognized in the title given to the Metroon at Athens, of a goddess known simply as μήτηρ θεῶν (Hom. *h.* 14). But there is nothing to connect her directly with Ge. Whether Sophocles here followed the Hesiodic tradition, or, as in the *Philoctetes*, meant to describe Rhea-Cybele, it is impossible to determine.

291

ἀναιδείας φάρος

291 Hesych. 1 p. 173 ἀναιδείας φάρος πίων Σοφοκλῆς 'Ινάχῳ· παρὰ τὸ (Hom. B 262) χλαίνάν τ' ἠδὲ χιτῶνα, τά τ' αἰδῶ ἀμφικαλύπτει.

φάρος may signify any *covering*, as in *Trach.* 916, where it is applied to bed-wrappings. For the shortening of the ᾱ in Sophocles see on fr. 360. The mysterious word πίων has not been elucidated: Junius conj. χιτών, Salmasius ποιόν (to be taken with φάρος), M. Schmidt παίζων or παρὰ Ἴωνι. One might suppose that the ἀναίδεια which required a cloak was that of the satyrs (cf. fr. 360).

292

ἀελλόθριξ

292 Hesych. 1 p. 54 ἀελλόθριξ· ποικιλόθριξ. ἢ πυρεωρούς καὶ συνεχεῖς ἔχουσα τὰς τρίχας, παρὰ τὴν ἄελλαν. Σοφοκλῆς 'Ινάχῳ.

It is not possible to believe that ἀελλόθριξ meant 'with hair floating in the wind,' as in *O.C.* 1261 κόμη δὲ αὔρας ἀκτένιστος ᾄσσεται. I should rather suppose that it affords an instance of comic hyperbole, in the sense of 'with disordered hair'; in that case we might correct Hesych. to παρηόρους (Palmerius and Toup) καὶ <οὐ> συνεχεῖς, 'straggling and not closely braided': cf. Plut. *qu. conv.* 4. 2. 4 p. 666 A εὔτονον γέγονε καὶ συνεχὲς αὐτῷ καὶ πυκνὸν τὸ ζῷον. [I have since found that this suggestion has been anticipated by Herwerden in *Mélanges Weil*, p. 182, who rightly prefers the form παρεώρους. Similarly R. Ellis, who proposed ἀσυνεχεῖς.]

293

ἀλωπός

293 See on fr. 263. As the text of Hesychius stands, it would seem that ἀλωπός occurred both in the *Thyestes* and in the *Inachus*. It is, however, not unlikely that the lemma ἀλαωπός, which has undoubtedly disappeared, was taken from the *Inachus*, and that the words ἀλαωπός· Σοφοκλῆς have been omitted after Θυέστῃ. See also on fr. 419.

294

ἄναντα

294 Hesych. I p. 178 ἄναντα· ἀνωφερῆ, ὑψηλά. τινές δὲ τὰ μὴ βεβρεγμένα. Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Ἰνάχῳ τὰ μὴ κεκομμένα (κεκωλυμένα cod.: corr. Salmasius). παρὰ τὸ αἰνεῖν (αἰνεῖν cod.), ὅ ἐστι κατακόπτοντα πτίσσειν (πτῆσιν cod.). Phot. ed. Reitz. p. 116, 18 has the same gloss with the addition of δυσχερῆ after ὑψηλά, and with ἐκκεκομμένα for κεκομμένα. The lemma of course related primarily to Hom. Ψ 116, and Photius adds that Aristarchus read ἄνατα there: cf. Eustath. *Il.* p. 1191, 45.

The rare verb αἰνεῖν is known principally as occurring in the proverb μολγὸν αἰνεῖν, of an impossibility. The reference here is perhaps to grain which did not require winnowing: cf. frs. 273, 275. In place of Salmasius's κεκομμένα Tucker would prefer ἐσκολυμμένα, comparing fr. 423. But the text is clearly right: cf. Hesych. I p. 335 ἀφῆνα· ἔκοψα, II p. 281 ἦναι· ἔκοψαι.

295

κημός

295 Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 1150 κημὸς ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ καδίσκου, εἰς ὃν τὰς ψήφους καθίεσαν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις. Κρατῖνος δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν Νόμοις (fr. 132, I 54 K.) 'σχοίνινον ἠμιόν' καλεῖ· τοιοῦτος γάρ ἐγίνετο καὶ ἦν παρόμοιος χώνῃ, ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰνάχῳ.

This surely implies that Sophocles described the κημός as funnel-shaped. Cf. Pollux 8. 123 καδον, ᾧ κημὸς ἐπέκειτο, δι' οὗ καθίετο ἡ ψῆφος. In the later days of the κύριος and ἄνυρος ἀμφορεύς, the corresponding part was called ἐπίθημα διερρινημένον (Arist. *Ath. pol.* col. 36, 8). There is some doubt whether the shape of the κημός was intended to secure secrecy, since in the fifth century the voting may have been open: see Starkie on *Vesp.* 987, and on the other side Gilbert, *Staatsalt.*[2] I 461. But, apart from this, there were obvious advantages in the bottle-necked opening. The word occurs in another sense in fr. 504. The allusion to the ballot-box no doubt occurred in the neighbourhood of fr. 288.

ΙΞΙΩΝ

The only evidence of the existence of this play is the quotation of a single word from it by two scholiasts not ultimately independent of each other. As Aeschylus undoubtedly wrote under this title, Welcker (p. 402) suggests not unreasonably that the reference to Sophocles may be an error (see Introduction, § 1). The subject, however, was a favourite one; and plays bearing the name *Ixion* were composed also by Euripides, Callistratus (*CIA* II 972, 15), and Timesitheus (Suid. *s.v.*).

296

δίψιον

296 Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 4. 14 *παρὰ τὸ ἴψαι Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰξίονι δίψιον φησὶ τὸ βεβλαμμένον.* Schol. Hom. Δ 171 in Cramer, *anecd. Par.* III p. 162, 25 *ἢ βλαβερὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴψιον ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἴψαι. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἰξίονι (ἐν Ἰερίονι* cod. Par.*) δίψιον κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ δ δίψιον ἄτησι βεβολημένον.* Nauck at one time thought that the last three words were a quotation from some epic poet, but afterwards recognized that Papageorgius had rightly proposed to substitute for them *δίψιον φησὶ τὸ βεβλαμμένον*, omitting the former occurrence of *δίψιον*.

Notwithstanding the absurdity of the etymology, it is quite conceivable that *δίψιον* may have been so used that *βεβλαμμένον*, *i.e.* 'checked,' appeared to be a suitable gloss for it. Thus in Aesch. *Cho.* 184 *ἐξ ὀμμάτων δὲ δίψιοι πίπτουσί μοι | σταγόνες ἄφρακτοι*, whether translated 'scant' or 'thirsty,' the reference seems to be to the tears which refuse to flow in measure corresponding to the inner emotion (see Verrall); and the schol. has *ποθειναί μοι· πρῴην ἄρευστοι.* Hesych. 1 p. 523 has *δῖψαι· βλάψαι*, which M. Schmidt supposes to be a fiction of the Alexandrian poets, *δίψιον· βλάπτικον*, possibly with reference to the present fragment, and *δίψιον Ἄργος...ἢ ὑπὸ Διὸς βεβλαμμένον· ἴψαι γὰρ τὸ βλάψαι.* Cf. *Etym. M.* p. 279, 55 *δίψα· παρὰ τὸ ἵπτω τὸ βλάπτω, ἴψα καὶ δίψα, ἡ βλάπτουσα τὸ σῶμα. Etym. Gud.* p. 148, 25.

ΙΟΒΑΤΗΣ

The famous story of Bellerophon appears first in Hom. Z 155—202, where, however, Iobates is not mentioned by name. Welcker (pp. 416—418) identified the plot with part of the narrative extracted from Asclepiades (*FHG* III 303) by the schol. on Hom. Z 155 *ὁ δὲ Προῖτος αὐτόχειρ μὲν οὐκ ἐβουλήθη τὸν Βελλεροφόντην ἀποκτεῖναι, πέμπει δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς Λυκίαν πρὸς τὸν πενθερὸν Ἰοβάτην, ἀδοκήτως καθ' ἑαυτοῦ κομίζοντα γράμματα. ὃ δὲ πολλοῖς αὐτὸν ἐγγυμνάσας ἄθλοις, ὡς οὐκ ἐώρα φθειρόμενον, ὑπετόπησε τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ στρατηγηθεῖσαν δεινὴν καταβουλήν· τοσοῦτον γὰρ κακῶν ὄχλον τῇ δυνάμει κατηγωνίσατο. ἔδωκε δὲ αὐτῷ πρὸς γάμον τὴν ἰδίαν θυγατέρα Κασάνδραν καὶ τῆς βασιλείας μοῖράν τινα.* This is a plausible enough guess, but has no other foundation than the presumption afforded by the title that the action of the drama took place in Lycia. When Welcker proceeds to assume that the play opened with the return of Bellerophon from the last of his trials, *i.e.* the λόχος of Z 189, he is on very insecure ground. Euripides wrote two plays on the subject, the *Stheneboea* (*TGF* p. 567) and the *Bellerophon* (*ib.* p. 443). The scene of the former must have been Tiryns, and in the latter the attempt to ascend to Olympus and the subsequent misfortunes of the hero were described. The adventures in Lycia are related without any variation of substance by Apollod. 2. 30—33, Hygin. *fab.* 57, and several

other authorities; but it is worthy of mention that Hyginus makes the betrothal of Bellerophon to the daughter of Iobates subsequent to the fall from Pegasus. We are certainly not compelled to assume that the treatment of Sophocles was so distinct from that of Euripides as to ignore the ὕβρις of Bellerophon, which Pindar discreetly veiled in *Ol.* 13. 91, but condemned unhesitatingly in *Isth.* 7. 44 ff.: τὸ δὲ πὰρ δίκαν | γλυκὺ πικροτάτα μένει τελευτά.

297

καὶ νῷν τι σῆμα λαμπρὸν ἐνδεῖξαι βίου

297 *Lex. Messan.* f. 281 r. νῶιν (νῶι cod.: corr. Rabe) ἔχει τὸ ῑ ὡς καὶ τὸ σφῶιν...Σοφοκλῆς Ἰοβάτῃ (ἰοκ. στη cod., as deciphered by Rabe. A tragedy by Sophocles entitled *Iocasta* is of course incredible). 'κα<ὶ> νῶιν...βίου.'

Nauck doubts if the text is sound, and the meaning is not clear. Blaydes well conjectures σχῆμα for σῆμα: cf. *Ant.* 1169 καὶ ζῆ τύραννον σχῆμ' ἔχων.

298

τὸν Ἀΐδαν γὰρ οὐδὲ γῆρας οἶδε φιλεῖν.

298 Stob. *flor.* 119. 6 (IV p. 1076, 1 Hense) 1 Σοφοκλέους Ἰοβάτου. 'τὸν... φιλεῖν.' The extract appears in A only of Hense's MSS, being omitted by SM.

H. thought that γάρ was due to an attempt to make an iambic line out of an apparently unmetrical quotation: see *On editing Aeschylus*, p. 121. Hence he suggested τὸν <δ'> Ἀΐδαν | οὐδὲ γῆρας οἶδε φιλεῖν, with glyconic rhythm [cf. J. W. White in *C. Q.* III 293]; or else that something has been lost after τὸν Ἀΐδαν γὰρ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑. F. W. Schmidt defends his τὸν Ἀΐδην γὰρ οὐδ' ὁ γηραιὸς φιλεῖ by quoting Eur. fr. 936, but Sophocles has no other example of Ἀΐδης in iambics. Hence Blaydes improves it to τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἄιδην κτέ., but the change is much too violent, even if it is necessary to alter the text at all.

The thought that the old cling to life more than the young is a commonplace: see fr. 66. Eur. *Alc.* 669 μάτην ἄρ' οἱ γέροντες εὔχονται θανεῖν, | γῆρας ψέγοντες καὶ μακρὸν χρόνον βίου· | ἢν δ' ἐγγὺς ἔλθῃ θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βούλεται | θνῄσκειν, τὸ γῆρας δ' οὐκέτ' ἔστ' αὐτοῖς βαρύ. Alexis fr. 235, II 383 K. τὸν γὰρ ὕστατον | τρέχων δίαυλον τοῦ βίου, ζῆν βούλομαι. Aesop's fable of the old man and the bundle of faggots is to the same effect (*Aesop. fab.* 90 Halm). Arist. *rhet.* 2. 13. 1389b 37 καὶ φιλόζωοι καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῇ τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ.

299

ἀφύλλωτον πέτραν

299 Hesych. 1 p. 341 ἀφύλλωτον πέτραν· ἄπορον (ἄφορον Toup, ἄσπορον M. Schmidt), ἀδένδρον, οἷον λεωπετρίαν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰοβάτῃ.

A bare rock without any sign of vegetation may be either a sheer precipice or a peak rising above the snow-line: cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 802 ἢ λισσὰς αἰγίλιψ ἀπρόσμεικτος οἰόφρων κρεμὰς | γυπιὰς πέτρα. Contrast Eur. *Her.* 790 Πυθίου δενδρῶτι πέτρα,—of the pine-woods on Parnassus. For ἀφύλλωτος see on fr. 249.

ΙΠΠΟΝΟΥΣ

Hipponous, King of Olenus in Achaia[1], finding his daughter Periboea to be with child, sent her across the straits to Oeneus at Calydon in Aetolia, bearing a secret message that she is to be made away with. Such was the account of Hesiod (fr. 97 Rz.), who makes her ravisher Hippostratus son of Amarynceus. It will be noticed that here Oeneus—apparently as dwelling in a remote and uncivilized corner of Greece—takes the place assigned to Nauplius in the stories of Aerope and Auge. According to others, Oeneus himself was the father of the child to whom Periboea afterwards gave birth, and Hipponous was aware of this when he sent his daughter to Calydon (Apollod. 1. 75). The *Thebais* (fr. 6 K.) simply related that Oeneus sacked Olenus and took away Periboea as his γέρας. But in Diodorus (4. 35) Periboea alleges that she is with child by Ares; and her father sent her to Oeneus to be destroyed. Oeneus, who had recently lost his wife Althaea and his son Meleager, had not the heart to kill Periboea, but married her and so became the father of Tydeus. Yet another variant is indicated by the proverb Τυδεὺς ἐκ συφορβίου (Plut. *prov.* 1. 5 [*Paroem.* 1 322]), which is explained by the story that Hipponous handed over his daughter Periboea, together with her infant child Tydeus, to the custody of swineherds. It is hardly possible to pick out the version of Sophocles from this medley; but Welcker was perhaps right (p. 428) in conjecturing that Oeneus himself was the father of the child, and that a recognition occurred in the course of the play.

There is an important reference to the play in Pollux 4. 111 τραγικὸν δ' οὐκ ἔστιν (*sc.* ἡ παράβασις)· ἀλλ' Εὐριπίδης αὐτὸ πεποίηκεν ἐν πολλοῖς δράμασιν. ἐν μέν γε τῇ Δανάῃ τὸν χορὸν τὰς γυναῖκας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τι ποιήσας παράδειν, ἐκλαθόμενος ὡς ἄνδρας λέγειν ἐποίησε τῷ σχήματι τῆς λέξεως τὰς γυναῖκας. καὶ Σοφοκλῆς δ' αὐτὸ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἀμίλλης ποιεῖ σπανιάκις, ὥσπερ ἐν Ἱππόνῳ. Nauck and others have drawn from this passage the inference that the chorus in the *Hipponous* consisted of women, who in a particular passage spoke of themselves in the masculine gender. But an examination of the context makes it clear that αὐτὸ ποιεῖ refers back to the opening of the section, defining παράβασις as the occasion when the chorus expressed the real opinions of the poet.

Pacuvius wrote a play entitled *Periboea*, but there is no particular indication that he followed Sophocles.

[1] See n. on fr. 300, from which I infer that Calydon was the scene of the play.

300

ἐξ Ὠλένου γῆς φορβάδος κομίζομαι.

300 Steph. Byz. p. 707, 14 Ὤλενος πόλις Ἀχαΐας καὶ Αἰτωλίας θηλυκῶς λεγομένη...Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἱππόνῳ (so Meursius for ἱπόνῳ or ἱπύνῳ or ἱππῶνι of the codd.) 'ἐξ . κομίζομαι.'

I suppose these to have been the words of Periboea on her arrival at Calydon from her native Olenus. The Aetolian Olenus is mentioned by Homer (B 639) together with other Aetolian towns. It was under Mt Aracynthus in the neighbourhood of Pleuron, and was destroyed by the Aeolians (Strabo 451, 460). On the other hand Homer did not mention the Achaean Olenus (Strabo 386). It might be thought that Sophocles would follow the Homeric geography, and in the *Thebais* (fr. 6 Kinkel), where Oeneus won Periboea as a prize at the sack of Olenus, the Aetolian town was probably intended. But the considerations in favour of Achaea are much stronger. Not only did Hesiod (fr. 97 Rz.) mention Hipponous the father of Periboea as sending her to Oeneus from his home at Olenus in Achaea, but Diodorus (4. 35), who tells the story in a form which may well have been that of Sophocles, also implies that Olenus was in Achaea. It should be added that the Achaean Olenus was also the scene of an adventure of Heracles, in which he avenged an insult offered to the daughter of Dexamenus by the centaur Eurytion (Pausan. 5. 3. 3, 7. 18. 1, Apollod. 2. 5. 5). Bacchylides, however, placed the incident in Elis (fr. 48 J.), from which the existence of a third Olenus has been inferred.—**γῆς φορβάδος** is 'the land that nourished me' like τῇ τε βοσκούσῃ χθονὶ | καὶ τῇ τρεφούσῃ Eur. *Hclid.* 826. In *Phil.* 700 γαίας φορβάδος is rather 'the bounteous earth.'

301

πρὸς ταῦτα κρύπτε μηδέν, ὡς ὁ πάνθ' ὁρῶν καὶ πάντ' ἀκούων πάντ' ἀναπτύσσει χρόνος.

301. **1** ὁ πάνθ' Clem., Stobaei F: ἅπανθ' Gellius, Stobaei P **2** χρόνους cod. L Clementis

301 Clem. Alex. *strom.* 6 p. 742 Σοφοκλέους δὲ ἐξ Ἱππόνου 'πρὸς . χρόνος.' The lines are also quoted by Stob. *ecl.* 1. 8. 17, p. 96, 8 W., with the lemma σοφοκλ' placed in F in the margin opposite to the second v. of the quotation, and in P opposite to the first v. of the next quotation. Wachsmuth, no doubt rightly, inferred that the lemma belonged to this extract; and it follows that the lines formerly attributed to Sophocles as fr. 833 N². [= 658 D.] are shown to be of uncertain authorship (Tr. fr. adesp. 509 N².). Gellius *Noct. Att.* 12. 11. 6 *propterea versus istos Sophocli, prudentissimi poetarum, in ore esse habendos dicebat*: πρὸς . χρόνος.

πρὸς ταῦτα is regularly combined with the imperative or its equivalent: see Jebb on *Ai.* 971, Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 622, Eur. *Hclid.* 978 n.—**ὁ πάνθ' ὁρῶν χρόνος**: cf. *O. T.* 1213 ἐφεῦρέ σ' ἄκονθ' ὁ πάνθ' ὁρῶν χρόνος, *O. C.* 1454 ὁρᾷ ὁρᾷ πάντ' ἀεὶ χρόνος. Tr. fr. adesp. 510 ὀξὺ βλέπει γὰρ ὁ χρόνος, ὃς τὰ πάνθ' ὁρᾷ. Time is the *discoverer* or *revealer* who brings the truth to light: fr. 918, Pind. *Ol.* 10. 53 ὅ τ' ἐξελέγχων μόνος | ἀλήθειαν ἐτήτυμον | Χρόνος, Eur. *Hipp.* 1051 οὐδὲ μηνυτὴν χρόνον δέξῃ καθ' ἡμῶν; fr. 441 χρόνος διέρπων πάντ' ἀληθεύειν φιλεῖ.—Wecklein would read πᾶν ἀναπτύσσει, which is attractive but hardly necessary. Cf. *El.* 639.

302

σωτηρίας γὰρ φάρμακ' οὐχὶ πανταχοῦ
βλέψαι πάρεστιν, ἐν δὲ τῇ προμηθίᾳ...

302 Orion *flor.* 4. 2, p. 46, 10 *ἐκ τοῦ Ἱππόνου Σοφοκλέους.* '*σωτηρίας...τῇ προμηθείᾳ.*'

It seems probable (though the assumption is not necessary) that the sentence is incomplete, and that something like *κέρδος μέγιστον* followed the words quoted. There is moreover clearly some dislocation in the text of Orion, as Schneidewin pointed out. For the profit to be earned from foresight is often mentioned: fr. 950. 3, Eur. *Andr.* 690 *ἐμοὶ δὲ κέρδος ἡ προμηθία*, *Suppl.* 510 *καὶ τοῦτό τοι τἀνδρεῖον, ἡ προμηθία* ('discretion is the better part of valour'). 'A saving remedy is not to be had for the asking': for the genitive of description **σωτηρίας φάρμακα** cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1055 *σωτηρίας δὲ τοῦτ' ἔχει τί νῷν ἄκος; Phoen.* 893 *φάρμακον σωτηρίας.* Cobet (*V. L.* p. 60), commenting on *φλυαρίας φάρμακον* in Alciphron, remarks: 'usitatius *φάρμακον* dicitur id *quo quid efficitur* quam contra.'—**βλέψαι**, to catch sight of, is suspected by Blaydes, who requires *εὑρεῖν* or *ὁρᾶν*. See also on fr. 583, 2.

303

ἀπαλέξασθαι

303 Hesych. 1 p. 225 *ἀπαλέξασθαι· ἀποφυλάξασθαι. Σοφοκλῆς Ἱππόνῳ.* The same form occurs in *Ai.* 165 *χἠμεῖς οὐδὲν σθένομεν πρὸς ταῦτ'* | *ἀπαλέξασθαι σοῦ χωρίς, ἄναξ.* Similar forms, requiring a present *ἀλέκω* rather than *ἀλέξω*, appear in Hom. Hdt. Hippocr. Xen., as well as in Aesch. *Suppl.* 1063 *ὁ μέγας Ζεὺς ἀπαλέξαι κτέ.* See also Jebb on *O. T.* 539.

304

ἀπαρθένευτος

304 Hesych. 1 p. 227 *ἀπαρθένευτος· ἀκέραιος, καθαρά. Σοφοκλῆς Ἱππόνῳ.* Cf. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 418, 11 *ἀπαρθένευτος· ἀκέραιος, καθαρός* (*καθαρά* conj. Blaydes).

ἀπαρθένευτος in Eur. *I. A.* 993, *Phoen.* 1739, means *unmaidenly*, but in *carm. pop.* 8 (*PLG* III 657) *σοί, Βάκχε, τάνδε μοῦσαν ἀγλαΐζομεν* | *...καινάν, ἀπαρθένευτον, οὔτι ταῖς πάρος* | *κεχρημέναν ᾠδαῖσιν, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον* | *κατάρχομεν τὸν ὕμνον* Smyth is undoubtedly right in rendering 'virgin.' Wecklein refers to the use of *κορεύειν* (usually *διακορεύειν*) for *devirginare*, but nothing similar is recorded of *παρθενεύω*.

ΙΦΙΓΕΝΕΙΑ

The character of the plot is indicated by two of the fragments. The authorities who quote fr. 305 refer to the betrothal of Iphigenia to Achilles, making it plain that the progress of the action was similar to that of the *Iphigenia at Aulis* of Euripides. It is also known that Clytaemnestra accompanied her daughter to Aulis, and that Odysseus was one of those who were privy to

the plot. The latter circumstance probably shows, as we shall see, that Sophocles followed the version of the *Cypria* more closely than Euripides. Welcker (p. 107 ff.) suggests that the relations between Odysseus and Achilles were of the same kind as the dealings of the former with Neoptolemus in the *Philoctetes*. This evidence is confirmed by fr. 308, which may reasonably be referred to the delay of the expedition at Aulis.

The version of the *Cypria*, according to the epitome of Proclus (*EGF* p. 19), was as follows: *καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἠθροισμένου τοῦ στόλου ἐν Αὐλίδι Ἀγαμέμνων ἐπὶ θήρας βαλὼν ἔλαφον ὑπερβάλλειν ἔφησε καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν[1]· μηνίσασα δὲ ἡ θεὸς ἐπέσχεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ πλοῦ χειμῶνας ἐπιπέμπουσα· Κάλχαντος δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν τῆς θεοῦ μῆνιν καὶ Ἰφιγένειαν κελεύσαντος θύειν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, ὡς ἐπὶ γάμον αὐτὴν Ἀχιλλεῖ μεταπεμψάμενοι θύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν· Ἄρτεμις δὲ αὐτὴν ἐξαρπάσασα εἰς Ταύρους μετακομίζει καὶ ἀθάνατον ποιεῖ, ἔλαφον δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς κόρης παρίστησι τῷ βωμῷ.* Apollod. *epit.* 3. 21, 22 reproduces this with hardly any addition, except the statement that Odysseus and Talthybius were sent to negotiate with Clytaemnestra, with the plea that Iphigenia should be given in marriage to Achilles as the price for obtaining his participation in the war. Hygin. *fab.* 98, which Nauck and others suggest to have been derived from Sophocles, is exactly similar, except that Diomedes takes the place of Talthybius. We shall hardly go wrong in inferring that these extracts give us a rough outline of the Sophoclean play.

Of the *Iphigenia* of Aeschylus (*TGF* p. 31) hardly anything is known. Ennius, in his play bearing this title, is believed to have followed Euripides (Ribbeck, p. 94 f.); but from a considerable fragment quoted by Gellius (*N.A.* 19. 10. 12) it appears that the chorus consisted of Argive warriors. Hence Bergk, followed by Welcker, conjectured that this feature was borrowed by Ennius from Sophocles. It should be added that the substance of the fragment (fr. 111 *otio qui nescit uti plus negoti habet | quam si cuist negotiosus animus in negotio*) resembles the thought of fr. 308; but the coincidence hardly establishes Bergk's inference.

Welcker conjectured that the title *Clytaemnestra*, known to us from a single quotation (fr. 334), was a careless allusion to the present play. That is possible; but it is perhaps more natural to refer the notice to the *Aegisthus*, if such a play existed (p. 21). The *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus seems to have been regarded as an unapproachable model, and, if Sophocles treated the subject at all, he probably reverted to the Homeric standpoint.

[1] Observe the close resemblance to *El.* 569 (Jebb's n.).

305

σὺ δ' ὦ μεγίστων τυγχάνουσα πενθερῶν

305 Phot. *lex.* p. 410, 13 (Suid. *s.v.*) *πενθερά· τῷ νυμφίῳ ἡ τῆς κόρης μήτηρ. καὶ πενθερός, ὁ πατήρ.* Εὐριπίδης δὲ γαμβρὸν αὐτὸν παρὰ τάξιν λέγει [quoting Eur. frs. 72, 647]...Σοφοκλῆς δὲ τὸ ἔμπαλιν· εἶπε γὰρ *πενθερὸν τὸν γαμβρὸν ἐν* Ἰφιγενείᾳ. Ὀδυσσεὺς φησὶ πρὸς Κλυταιμήστραν *περὶ* Ἀχιλλέως. *'σὺ δ'...πενθερῶν.' ἀντὶ τοῦ γαμβρῶν.* Cf. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 229, 1 and *Etym. M.* p. 220, 40 Σοφοκλῆς δὲ τὸν *πενθερὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ γαμβροῦ τέθεικεν* (λέγει *Etym. M.*).

Both *πενθερός* and *γαμβρός* are used loosely for *marriage-connexions*. In Eur. *El.* 1286 *τὸν λόγῳ σὸν πενθερόν*, addressed to Orestes concerning the *αὐτουργός*, *π.* = *brother-in-law*. So *γαμβρός* must be rendered *father-in-law* in Eur. *Andr.* 641 and *γαμβροί* 'parents-in-law' in *Hipp.* 635.—Notice that **πενθερῶν** is an allusive plural, if we can trust the statement that it refers to Achilles: so *O. T.* 1176 *κτανεῖν νιν τοὺς τεκόντας* (*i.e.* his father) *ἦν λόγος*. See Kuehner-Gerth I 18.—For the importance of this passage in relation to the plot see Introductory Note.

306

ὀξηρὸν ἄγγος οὐ μελισσοῦσθαι πρέπει.

306 *μελιττοῦσθαι* codd.

306 *Proverb. append.* 4. 27 (*Paroem.* I 440) *ὀξηρὸν...πρέπει. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀναξίου. Σοφοκλῆς* Ἰφιγενείᾳ.

The significance of the proverb is similar to Matth. *evang.* 9. 17 *οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νεὸν εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς*: the vinegar-pot is not fit afterwards to contain honey. In the same manner is fr. 611.

ὀξηρὸν ἄγγος: so *ὀξηρὸν κεράμιον* in Ar. fr. 723 (I 566 K.), *κώνωψ ὀξηρῷ τερπόμενος κεράμῳ A. P.* 12. 108. There is a similar reference to a homely proverb in Aesch. *Ag.* 334 f. *ὄξος τ' ἄλειφά τ' ἐγχέας ταὐτῷ κύτει | διχοστατοῦντ' ἂν οὐ φίλω προσεννέποις.*—**μελισσοῦσθαι** is written *μελιττοῦσθαι* in the text of the source. The form has been suspected, since *μελιτοῦσθαι* appears elsewhere with this meaning: Plut. *qu. conv.* I. 10. 2, p. 628 D, Democritus enquired the reason why a cucumber tasted sweet, and the waiting-woman replied, *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀγνοήσασα τὸ σίκυον εἰς ἀγγεῖον ἐθέμην μεμελιτωμένον*. Hence Nauck (*Index* p. xii) proposed *οὐχὶ μελιτοῦσθαι*. But, as Sophocles uses *μέλισσα* in the sense of *μέλι* (*O. C.* 481), there is no reason why he should not have adopted *μελισσοῦσθαι* for *μελιτοῦσθαι*. The formation is as legitimate in one case as in the other (cf. *γεφυροῦσθαι*); and the *-οω* suffix became enormously productive with causative function (Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.* IV p. 297 E. tr.).

307

νόει πρὸς ἀνδρὶ χρῶμα πουλύπους ὅπως πέτρᾳ τραπέσθαι γνησίου φρονήματος.

307. **1** *νόει* codd.: *νοῦν δεῖ* Porson | *παρ' ἀνδρί* Reiske, *πρὸς ἄνδρα* Gomperz | *χρῶμα* Reiske: *σῶμα* codd. **2** *πέτραν* Gomperz | *γνησίου ἐκ φρονήματος* C. Keil

307 Athen. 513 D *ὁμοίως φησὶ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν* Ἰφιγενείᾳ *'νόει ... φρονήματος.'*

The trick of the polypus in concealing itself from its foes or in lying in wait for its prey is often mentioned: Aelian *v. h.* I 1 *ἑλλοχῶσι δὲ οἱ πολύποδες καὶ τοὺς ἰχθῦς τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον. ὑπὸ ταῖς πέτραις κάθηνται, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἐς τὴν ἐκείνων μεταμορφοῦσι χρόαν, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι δοκοῦσιν*

ὅπερ οὖν καὶ πεφύκασιν αἱ πέτραι. Arist. *h. a.* 9. 37. 622ᵃ 8, adding τὸ δ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ φοβηθείς, Plin. *n. h.* 9. 29. 87 *colorem mutat ad similitudinem loci et maxime in metu*, [Arist.] *mir. auscult.* 29, Lucian *dial. mar.* 4. 3 ὁποίᾳ ἂν πέτρᾳ προσελθὼν ἁρμόσῃ τὰς κοτύλας... ἐκείνῃ ὅμοιον ἀπεργάζεται ἑαυτόν, καὶ μεταβάλλει τὴν χρόαν, μιμούμενος τὴν πέτραν, ὡς ἂν λάθῃ τοὺς ἁλιέας κτέ., *A. P.* 9. 10. 3 οὕτω δ' ἦν πέτρῃ ἴκελος χρόα (*sc.* πούλυπος). In this connexion there is a constant appearance of the words μεταβολαί, τροπαί, and the corresponding verbs: Plut. *aet. phys.* 19 p. 916 B, C, *de sollert. anim.* 27 p. 978 E, *quomodo adul. ab am. intern.* 8 p. 52 F, *de am. mult.* 9 p. 96 F. Hence the transformations of the polypus passed into a proverb (Diogen. 1. 23 πολύποδος πολυχρόου νόον ἴσχε, Zenob. 1. 24 [*Parœm.* 1 pp. 8, 184]), and were applied to the wily man's adaptability to his surroundings (τὸ πολύτροπον), either with commendation as here and in Theogn. 215 f. πουλύπου ὀργὴν ἴσχε πολυπλόκου, ὃς ποτὶ πέτρῃ, | τῇ προσομιλήσῃ, τοῖος ἰδεῖν ἐφάνη, Pind. fr. 43 ὦ τέκνον, | ποντίου θηρὸς πετραίου | χρωτὶ μάλιστα νόον | προσφέρων πάσαις πολίεσσιν ὁμίλει· | τῷ παρεόντι δ' ἐπαινήσαις ἑκών | ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοῖα φρονεῖ. Anon. ap. Clearch. (*FHG* II 318) in Athen. 317 A (cf. Antig. *hist. mir.* 29) πουλύποδός μοι, τέκνον, ἔχων νόον, Ἀμφίλοχ' ἥρως, | τοῖσιν ἐφαρμόζου τῶν κεν <κατὰ> δῆμον ἵκηαι, —or the reverse, as in Ion fr. 36 καὶ τὸν πετραῖον πλεκτάναις ἀναίμοσιν | στυγῶ μεταλλακτῆρα ποικίλου χροός, and in Plutarch. These passages offer abundant evidence in support of Reiske's χρῶμα, if they do not also, as J. thinks, completely justify πρὸς ἀνδρί. Further, I infer that τραπέσθαι means 'to change,' being followed by φρονήματος as an abl. gen. of separation: see Theogn. 218 κρίσσων τοι σοφίη γίνεται ἀτροπίης. J. however renders: 'Be mindful to adapt the hue of your real thought to your man, as the polypus adapts it to the rock'—but surely his real thought is what the πολύτροπος desires to conceal from his fellow men.—**πρὸς ἀνδρί** means 'as you approach another,' 'when close to him'; for which cf. πρὸς τοῖς πολεμίοις εἶναι Thuc. 3. 22, 77, and πρὸς αὐτῷ γ' εἰμι τῷ δεινῷ λέγειν *O. T.* 1169. J., whose view is somewhat different, compares *Ai.* 95 ἔβαψας ἔγχος εὖ πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατῳ. —**πουλύπους**: for the Ionism see Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, § 254, and Jebb on *Ant.* 86.—**πέτρᾳ** might be a locative dative (*Phil.* 144), but it is more likely that we should carry on the influence of πρός from the main clause. Cobet, *Var. Lect.* p. 163 ff., laid down the important distinction that, when the clause of comparison precedes, no preposition accompanies the noun of the main sentence (*e.g.* Plat. *rep.* 414 E δεῖ ὡς περὶ μητρὸς καὶ τροφοῦ τῆς χώρας ἀμύνειν); but that, when the comparison follows, the preposition must appear in the second clause. He consequently emended the fragment of Antiphanes: πρὸς γὰρ τὸ γῆρας ὥσπερ ἐργαστήριον | ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια προσφοιτᾷ κακά by writing ὡς πρὸς ἐργαστήριον. No doubt the distinction is generally observed, but Kock (II 116) and Gomperz (*Nachl.* p. 7) seem right in denying its universality.—There is no need for violent alterations like Blaydes's σοφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς, or Pflugk's δεινοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς γνῶμα πουλύπου τρόπου | παρεκτραπέσθαι γνησίου φρονήματος. Porson's νοῦν δεῖ makes the structure more symmetrical by providing an accusative to balance χρῶμα, but introduces the fresh awkwardness of leaving χρῶμα to represent both νοῦν and φρονήματος, which are apparently distinguished. Since τρέπεσθαι is used in the required sense as well absolutely as with a limiting accusative, it may be doubted whether any change is necessary. Bergk's σχῆμα (for σῶμα) would avoid this particular difficulty.—J. thinks that the words were spoken by Odysseus, who was the agent of Agamemnon's fraud. Bergk, who understood ἀνδρί as 'husband,' thought that Clytaemnestra was addressing her daughter.

308

τίκτει γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐσθλὸν εἰκαία σχολή.

308 εἰκαία σχολή S: εἰ καὶ ἀσκολὴ (ἀσχολὴ A) MA

308 Stob. *flor.* 30. 6 (III p. 664. 12 Hense) **Σοφοκλέους Ἰφιγενείαι.** 'τίκτει... σχολή.' θεὸς δὲ τοῖς ἀργοῦσιν οὐ παρίσταται (Tr. fr. adesp. 527).

I do not hesitate (with Nauck) to refer this line to the period of delay at Aulis, when the Greek fleet was kept back by contrary winds or a calm (Jebb on *El.*

564). See also on fr. 479, 4, *τερπνὸν ἀργίας ἄκος*. F.W. Schmidt had no justification for proposing *τίκτειν...εἰκαία φιλεῖ | σπουδή*, which recalls Seyffert's *σπουδῇ βραδύς* in *Ant.* 231. Nauck fell foul of *εἰκαία*, and conjectured *ἡ λίαν σχολή* (misprinted *σφολή*). But *εἰκαία σχολή* seems an entirely suitable phrase to distinguish an aimless inactivity (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 203 *πνοαὶ κακόσχολοι*, with the schol. *ἐπὶ κακῷ ποιοῦσαι σχολάζειν*) from that *σχολή* which is the indispensable condition of true freedom: see Eur. *Ion* 633 f., Arist. *pol.* 4 (7). 15. 1334[a] 20 *κατὰ γὰρ τὴν παροιμίαν, οὐ σχολὴ δούλοις*. The rarity of *εἰκαῖος* is probably accidental. Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 44 *βίος...εἰκῇ κείμενος*. Hense however thinks that *εἰκαία* is probably due to some philosopher (as Chrysippus) who only approved leisure as the result of deliberate choice. He quotes Sen. *de otio* 3, 3. 8, 1.

The line which follows in Stobaeus as if it belonged to the same extract was first separated from it by Wagner. It is found, with the reading *ἀργοῖσιν*, in *Menand. monost.* 242. For the sentiment see on fr. 407. An error of a precisely similar kind was made by Apostolius in quoting *Ai.* 1252 (see Jebb's ed. p. 237).

309

ἀκρουχεῖ

309 Hesych. I p. 107 *ἀκρουχεῖ· ἄκρον ἔχει. Ἄκρον δὲ ὄρος* (*ὄρους* cod.) *τῆς Ἀργείας, ἐφ' οὗ Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἱδρύσατο Μελάμπους καθάρας τὰς Προιτίδας, ἦγουν ταῖς Χάρισιν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰφιγενείᾳ.*

From this obscure but interesting passage we are justified in inferring that Sophocles used the word *ἀκρουχεῖ* for *dwells on the heights*, and probably that Artemis was the subject to the verb. Her connexion with the plot needs no remark, and there is sufficient evidence to prove that her cult was often established on the summit of a mountain. Hence Eur. *I. T.* 126 *ὦ παῖ τᾶς Λατοῦς | Δίκτυνν' οὐρεία*, and the similar epithets *ὀρειβάτις, ὀρεσίφοιτος, ὀρεστιάς, ὀρειάς* (Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1284[3]). In Argos she was worshipped under the title of *Ἀκρία*: Hesych. I p. 104 *Ἀκρία·...ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἥρα καὶ Ἄρτεμις καὶ Ἀφροδίτη προσαγορευομένη ἐν Ἄργει, κατὰ τὸ ὅμοιον ἐπ' ἄκρῳ ἱδρυμέναι*. At Epidaurus she bore the title *Κορυφαία* from her sanctuary on the top of Mt Coryphum (Pausan. 2. 28. 2). On the top of Mt Lycone close to the border of Argos and Arcadia was a temple of Artemis Orthia (Pausan. 2. 24. 5). On Mt Crathis in Arcadia was a sanctuary of the Pyronian Artemis, where a fire of peculiar sanctity was kept burning (Pausan. 8. 15. 9). She also had a sanctuary on Mt Artemisius above Oenoe (Pausan. 2. 25. 3). The rest of the gloss in Hesych. is a learned aetiological note intended to explain the *origin* of the word *ἀκρουχεῖ* as applied to Artemis. It is unnecessary to suppose that there was any allusion to the daughters of Proetus in the text of Sophocles. The story of their madness and its healing is most fully given in Apollod. 2. 24—29. In the account of Bacchylides (10. 40—112) there is no reference to Melampus. Hesych. is the only authority who mentions the mountain Acrum in connexion with this story; the scene of their healing is given either as Sicyon (Apollod., Pausan. 2. 7. 8), the river Anigrus in Elis (Pausan. 5. 5. 10, Strabo 346), or Lusi in Arcadia (Bacchyl., Pausan. 8. 18. 8 etc.). The last-mentioned alternative induced Jacobs (on *A. P.* [*append.* 420] XI p. 406) to make the violent and impossible conjecture *ἐν Λουσοῖς ἐν Ἀρκάσιν* in place of the words *ἦγουν ταῖς Χάρισιν*. Unger's *ἦγουν ταῖς χορείαις* (*Theb. Parad.* p. 459) rests on Apollod. 2. 29, where Melampus is said to have cured the Proetides by the employment of magic dancing (*μετ' ἀλαλαγμοῦ καί τινος ἐνθέου χορείας*). But the text of Hesych. has been so mutilated that the words may very well be sound, recording an alternative or joint cult of the Charites established by Melampus at the time of the healing. For the common worship of Artemis and the Charites see Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa II 1363. Wagner wished to substitute *ἀκροῦχε· ἄκρον ἔχουσα*, and M. Schmidt, who observed that the alphabetical order is slightly disturbed at this point, strangely suggested *Ἄκρ' ὀχεῖ*.

310

Βασίλη

310 Hesych. 1 p. 362 *βασίλη· βασίλεια* (βασιλ, *ἡ βασίλεια* codd.). Σοφοκλῆς Ἰφιγενείᾳ.

In Pind. *Nem.* 1. 39 *ἀλλὰ θεῶν βασίλεα* (so Schroeder: *βασίλεια* codd.) the word is trisyllabic, however written. The form *βασίλη* is also attested by Steph. Byz. p. 13. 1 *Ἀγάμμεια· λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀγάμμη, ὡς πρέσβεια πρέσβη, καὶ τὸ βασίλεια κατὰ συναλοιφὴν βασίλη.* Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, § 177, refers to Herodian 1 275, 3 Lentz. Cf. *ἱέρεα* on Attic inscriptions (Meisterhans[3], p. 40). It is worth mentioning that *βασίλεια* was a title of Artemis in Thrace (Hdt. 4. 32); but of course there is nothing to show that Sophocles used *βασίλη* as a divine title. For the form see also Usener, *Götternamen*, p. 222_{12}.

311

πύνδαξ

311 Hesych. 1 p. 267 *ἀπυνδακῶτος· ἀπεσταλμένος.* Σοφοκλῆς Τριπτολέμῳ (fr. 554). *ἐν δὲ Ἰφιγενείᾳ πύνδακα* (*πενδάκα* codd.) *τοῦ ξίφους τὴν λαβὴν ἔφη.* Eustath. *Il.* p. 870. 28 Σοφοκλῆς δὲ καὶ τὴν λαβὴν τοῦ ξίφους πύνδακα εἰρηκεν, ὡς φησὶ Παυσανίας (fr. 289 Schw.).

Similarly *πυθμήν* may be used for the *stem* or *trunk* of a tree, considered apart from the foliage: so Aesch. *Suppl.* 111 *οἷα νεάζει πυθμὴν | δι' ἀμὸν γάμον τεθαλώς | δυσπαραβούλοισι φρεσίν*, *Cho.* 203 *σμικροῦ γένοιτ' ἂν σπέρματος μέγας πυθμήν.*

312

ὕπαφρον

312 Erotian. *gloss. Hippocr.* p. 129. 1 attests that this word was used by Sophocles in the *Iphigenia*. See on fr. 236, where the source is quoted.

313

[*ὁ Ἀπόλλων παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς λαμβάνει τοὺς χρησμούς.*]

313 Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 793 *δοκεῖ γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόλλων παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς λαμβάνειν τοὺς χρησμούς, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰφικλείᾳ* (Ἰφιγενείᾳ conj. Schneider).

Schneider's conjecture, Ἰφιγ*ένεια* for Ἰφι*κλεία*, is probably right, as Ἰφικλεῖ (Boeckh, Welcker, and Hippenstiel) is an unlikely title: see Introductory Note to the *Oedipus*. Dindorf suggests Οἰνλεῖ as a possible alternative; but this is less likely to have been corrupted to Ἰφικλείᾳ.

Apollo, as a *μάντις*, is the mouthpiece of Zeus: Hom. *h. Ap.* 131 *χρήσω δ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν*, Aesch. *Eum.* 19 *Διὸς προφήτης δ' ἐστὶ Λοξίας πατρός*, fr. 86 *ταῦτα γὰρ πατὴρ | Ζεὺς ἐγκαθίει Λοξίᾳ θεσπίσματα*, Soph. *O. C.* 613 *εἰ Ζεὺς ἔτι Ζεὺς καὶ Διὸς Φοίβου σαφής*. Hence in *O. T.* 151 the oracle which has just been announced from Delphi is addressed as *ὦ Διὸς ἀδυνατὼ φάτι*: cf. *ibid.* 498. In Pind. *Ol.* 8. 43 Apollo interprets a portent: *ὦτι ἐμοὶ φάσμα λέγει Κρονίδα | πομφθὲν βαρυγδούπου Διός.*

ΙΧΝΕΥΤΑΙ ΣΑΤΥΡΟΙ

The three fragments which before 1911 were alone associated with this title were not of such a character as to reveal the subject-matter; and the guess of Welcker that the Trackers were engaged upon the search for Europa, when she was carried off by Zeus, and that of Ahrens that they were the prophets invited by Minos to search for Glaucus remained equally unverifiable. The obscurity has now been dispelled by the discovery, among the documents which have been recovered from the dust-heaps of Oxyrhynchus, of a large portion of a papyrus roll which contained the *Ichneutae*. The constituent fragments of the roll were successfully fitted together by Prof. A. S. Hunt, and in the result he was able to publish in vol. IX of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (no. 1174 at p. 30 ff.) the more or less complete remains of fifteen successive columns starting from the opening of the play and containing about 400 lines, some two-thirds of which are substantially intact. A number of smaller fragments which could not be located[1] adds little or nothing to the sum of our knowledge.

The MS, which is carefully written, is assigned to the closing decades of the second century A.D. A number of corrections, including marks of punctuation, has been added by a second hand, and various readings recorded in the margin proceed from the same source. These variants are sometimes quoted from specified authorities—particularly from the edition of Theon[2]; besides him, Aristophanes[3] and possibly Nicander[4] (or Nicanor) are cited. Another notable feature is the appearance of stichometric figures, giving the numeration of each hundredth line, which however do not agree exactly with the requirements of the text. From these circumstances it may be inferred that we have a critically revised text descended from a grammarian's copy. The MS is a less elaborate example of the type which is characteristically represented by the papyrus containing the *Paeans* of Pindar (*Ox. Pap.* v, no. 841).

[1] These are not included in the present edition, with the exception of fr. 317.

[2] Possibly the well-known grammarian, who lived in the age of Augustus and worked on the text of the Alexandrian poets. See Susemihl, *Al. Lit.* II 215 ff. Theon is also mentioned in a scholium on Pind. *Paean.* 2. 37. Wilamowitz (*Neue Jahrb.* XXIX 450) declines to speculate on the identity of this Theon.

[3] There is a possibility that some of the abbreviated references may be intended for Aristonicus or Aristarchus; see Hunt on III 20.

[4] By the abbreviation Nι in v. 102: the same authority is quoted on fr. 84 (*Ox. Pap.* IX p. 113) of the *Eurypylus*.

The subject of the play proves to be identical with that of the Homeric hymn to Hermes, although the development of the story proceeds upon somewhat different lines. The play opens with the appearance of Apollo, who relates the loss of his cattle and describes his hitherto unsuccessful attempts to discover the thief during his progress from Northern Greece to Mt Cyllene in Arcadia. He accordingly issues a proclamation to all whom it may concern, promising a definite reward to anyone who shall enable him to recover his property. Silenus enters in answer to the summons, and offers the assistance of his sons the satyrs, but stipulates that a reward of gold shall be paid over, and that he and his sons shall be released from slavery. Apollo leaves the stage, as the chorus of satyrs advances. They are ready at once to start in pursuit, and Silenus in a short speech invokes divine and human aid. Then the chorus, bending on all-fours and imitating the actions of keen-scented hounds, discover the confused tracks of cattle pointing in different directions. But, before the quarry can be run to earth, the pursuers are alarmed by a strange sound entirely unlike to any which they have hitherto known[1]. It seems to issue from the cave towards which the chase has brought them. Silenus upbraids them for their cowardice, and contrasts their degenerate attitude with his own distinguished bravery in the days of old. The hunt is then renewed, and Silenus undertakes to support and protect his children by accompanying them to the point of danger. The strange noise is again heard, and for a second time the ardour of the pursuit is damped. But the actual issue of the combined undertaking is not altogether clear. I have suggested that Silenus, just now so valiant, proves himself rather more of a coward than his followers, and by refusing to continue the adventure and abruptly leaving the stage, abandons the chorus to its fate. However this may be, it seems certain that subsequently the coryphaeus assumed the position previously occupied by Silenus as representative spokesman for his comrades; but it is probable that Silenus afterwards reappeared, or, if he was present throughout, resumed the prominence which he had temporarily abandoned.

After noisy but ineffectual efforts by the chorus to accomplish their task, the situation is suddenly changed by the arrival of Cyllene, the mountain-nymph, who comes forth from her cave[2]. Addressing the satyrs as 'beasts' (θῆρες), she angrily enquires what is the purpose of their new labours, and why the silence of

[1] I have assumed that βοιβδοι (n. on 107) is identical with ψόφοι of 138. The alarm is not so great on the first occasion, because the sound is indistinctly heard.

[2] See Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 827₄. Miss Harrison infers from 211 ff. that Cyllene occupied an *underground* cave dwelling: *Essays presented to W. Ridgeway*, p. 136 ff.

the glens has been disturbed by their shouts, and the hue and cry raised for the arrest of a thief. The chorus replies in humble tones, and asks for an explanation of the marvellous sound which comes echoing from the upland hollows. Cyllene, somewhat mollified, would have preferred to know their business first ; but finally, after warning them of the serious consequences which would follow a disclosure of the secret to others, she consents to explain what has astonished them. Zeus, it appears, having secretly visited the daughter of Atlas without the knowledge of Hera, had begotten a son by her. During the mother's illness, Cyllene has been nursing the newly-born infant. But he proved to be no ordinary child ; for, though born less than a week ago, his growth has been so rapid that he has already passed from childhood to maturity. As his father's command required that he should be kept concealed within the cave, he had occupied his time with the construction from a dead beast of a mysterious toy, which produces the strange melodies now in question. In answer to further requests for an explanation of the riddle, Cyllene describes the making of the lyre from the shell of the tortoise. There are some serious gaps in the papyrus at this point, but, since the chorus immediately proceeds to denounce the divine child as the thief of whom they are in search, it is clear that Cyllene must have referred to the ox-hide which had been stretched over the shell. She waxes indignant at their audacity: to charge the son of such parents with larceny is a monstrous piece of insolence, which betrays the childish ineptitude of the accusers. Let them beware lest their foolish gibes are not exchanged for cries of pain. Nevertheless, the satyrs persist, and apparently challenge Cyllene to produce the cows, so that their identity may be established.

Here unfortunately the papyrus ends, and we can only guess at the sequel. It is certain that Apollo returned, and that in consequence of the recovery of the cattle he rewarded Silenus according to his promise. The reconciliation with Hermes must have followed, and no doubt the gift of the lyre placated Apollo for the outrage which had been committed against his property.

Such is the story of the play so far as we are permitted to trace it, and it is apparent that it differs in several respects from the Homeric version. (1) The theft of the cows here precedes, but in "Homer" follows the invention of the lyre. (2) The cows are concealed on Mt Cyllene itself and not in the neighbourhood of Triphylian Pylos. (3) Cyllene[1] and not Maia has charge of the infant. (4) The informer, to whom later writers gave the name of Battus, is displaced by the satyrs,—an essential

[1] For other traces of this tradition see n. on 266.

modification in view of the dramatic requirements. We know little or nothing of the intermediate literature[1], and, so far as we can tell, the only innovation for which Sophocles was responsible may have been the introduction of the satyrs. The details of the cattle-stealing are less complex than in the hymn, and the choice of Mt Cyllene as the hiding-place of the herd is at least as likely to have been a reversion to the primitive legend as a necessary outcome of the dramatic situation[2]. Apollodorus in the mythographical handbook (3. 112 ff.) follows generally the narrative of the hymn; but, though he differs widely from Sophocles, he nevertheless agrees with him in making the theft of the cattle prior to the invention of the lyre, and also in connecting the two incidents together as part of the same operation. According to Apollodorus, Hermes made strings for his lyre from the guts of the slain cattle; we cannot say whether this point was mentioned by Sophocles, but he certainly alluded to the skins of the cows having been used in the construction of some part of the instrument (307 n., 337, 366). The latter proceeding is a reminiscence of the hymn[3]; but the ox-hide there mentioned did not belong to Apollo's cattle, which Hermes had not yet stolen. Similarly, the hymn-writer, as contrasted with Apollodorus, mentions sheep-gut as the material out of which Hermes fashioned the strings. Although Apollodorus has much in common with the hymn, it is idle to suppose that he made it his sole source, and that his deviations from it were the fruit of his own invention[4].

The most striking result of the comparison of Sophocles with the hymn is the combination by the former of two distinct achievements, so that the invention of the lyre not only provides the means of appeasing the indignation of Apollo, but also appears to have been directly prompted by the theft of the cows. The linking together of these separate threads was a dramatic advantage which Sophocles observed and appropriated, even if it originated, as may well have been the case, with one of

[1] A solitary fragment is preserved from the hymn of Alcaeus (fr. 5): χαῖρε Κυλλάνας ὀ μέδεις, σὲ γάρ μοι | θύμιος ὕμνην τὸν κορυφαῖο' ἐν ἄγναις | Μαῖα γέννατο Κρονίδα μιγεῖσα | παμβασιλῆι. Cf. Pausan. 7. 20. 4, Hor. *Carm.* 1. 10.

[2] Wilamowitz, p. 454. The same critic takes the view that the intimate connexion which had always subsisted in popular tradition between the cattle-stealing and the making of the lyre was deliberately sundered by the hymn-writer. But this is open to serious doubt, as will presently be shown.

[3] vv. 47—49.

[4] See Allen and Sikes, *Homeri Hymni*, p. 131, rejecting Gemoll's view. In fact, the sources of 'Apollodorus' are much more complex; from the discussion of E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa 1 2875 ff. the following sentence is relevant: 'diese Litteratur ist eine compilatorische, die nur mit Überkommenem wirtschaftet und die Überlieferung nicht bereichert oder wissenschaftlich ordnet, sondern excerpiert und verdünnt.' See also Introduction, § 2.

his literary predecessors. It is more likely that this arrangement, which involved an alteration in the order of the events described in the hymn, was the deliberate invention of conscious art, than that popular tradition had always combined what the hymn-writer chose from a motive not easily discernible to separate[1]. Both in method and in spirit the treatment of Sophocles is far removed from the work of the hymn-writer, but the extent of the debt which the tragedian must have acknowledged cannot be accurately measured owing to the loss of the second half of the play. It would have been particularly illuminating to discover what were the Attic traits added by Sophocles to the portrait of Hermes, whose precocious trickery is so cleverly delineated in the hymn. There are enough resemblances in detail to show that Sophocles was well acquainted with the Homeric text, as may be seen from the following instances: *ὄστρακον h.* 33 and S. 305; *h.* 38 *ἦν δὲ θάνῃς, τότε κεν μάλα καλὸν ἀείδοις* compared with S. 292 f.; *φηλητής h.* 67, 214, 446, and S. 332; *μήνυτρον h.* 264 and S. 81; *βοῶν στίβος h.* 353 and S. 109, 182; *h.* 8 f. and S. 264 (*h.* 6 *ἄντρον ἔσω ναίουσα παλίσκιον* answers to S. 265); *τὰ χρήματα* in *h.* 400 may have suggested S. 44 *ὅπως τὸ χρῆμα τοῦτό σοι κυνηγέσω*; *h.* 407 f. *θαυμαίνω* and *ἀέξεσθαι* recall S. 271 f., although the application is different (the same considerations apply to *ἀπονοσφίζεσθαι* and *δονεῖν* in *h.* 562 f. as compared with S. 131 and 282); *βήματα ἀντία h.* 345 and S. 96, 112; the description of Cyllene in *h.* 228 answers to S. 215.

The other literary allusions to the story need not detain us long. Philostratus (*imag.* 1. 25, entitled *Ἑρμοῦ γοναί*) makes Olympus the birthplace, and except in one small detail[2] is entirely remote from Sophocles. Antoninus Liberalis[3] (23) relates the story of Battus for the purpose of recording the punishment inflicted upon him for his treachery; the theft of the cows was of secondary importance to him, and the only part of his narrative which concerns us is the itinerary of the cattle-drive, which may be used to illustrate the mutilated lines following v. 13. Ovid (*Met.* 2. 676–707) confines himself even more strictly to the subject of the transformation of Battus. The anonymous scholiast on Antoninus, who drew his information from the *Λειμών* of Pamphilus, prefaces this chapter with the

[1] The hymn to Hermes is considered to be the latest in date of the longer hymns, but must be at least as early as the sixth century B.C. Robert (*Herm.* XLI 389 ff.) argues that the entire incident of the invention of the lyre was a subsequent interpolation in the original form of the hymn, and that signs of the inconsistency thereby produced are still visible. See also Herwerden, *Mnem.* XXXV 181 ff., Kuiper, *ib.* XXXVIII 1 ff.

[2] See n. on 354.

[3] He is usually assigned to the age of the Antonines.

citation of several authorities who had previously written on the subject. Nicander, Didymarchus, Antigonus, and Apollonius Rhodius belong to a later age; and it is improbable that Hesiod's *Ἐοῖαι* (fr. 153 Rz.) had any bearing upon the subsequent treatment of Sophocles. The gift of the *κηρύκειον* by Apollo to Hermes is indicated in the hymn (529) and expressly recorded by later authorities[1]. If the tradition was known to Sophocles, it seems unlikely that he would pass it over in silence.

However interesting the discovery of the new fragments may be, they will scarcely enhance the reputation of the poet. The dramatic value of the play is insignificant, and the comic relief not greatly exhilarating. It is fair to admit that the more amusing scenes probably occurred in the latter part of the play, when Hermes displayed his cunning and his wit in tricking and conciliating his accuser[2]. But the part which is preserved is less lively and entertaining than the *Cyclops*, which has hitherto been our only example of the satyric drama. Yet, although it is impossible to rate highly the importance of the play as we know it, we must beware of pronouncing a final judgment on what is actually a torso, more particularly as the recovered fragment has merits of its own which may be pleaded in mitigation of an adverse verdict. Chief among these are directness of purpose and clearness of outline, which, allied in general to a plainness of diction suitable to the simplicity of the action[3], leave an impression of natural grace and exhibit in a less familiar sphere a fresh specimen of Attic versatility.

By a curious accident the lyrical parts of the *Ichneutae* have been mutilated to an extent much exceeding the losses of the dialogue; but enough of them remains to show that they resembled the choruses of the *Cyclops* in being far less elaborate than the lyrics of tragedy. It seems that Sophocles, perhaps even to a greater degree than Euripides, avoided any attempt at elevation of style in compositions of this character. The lyrical metres, also, are of a simple kind, being mostly variations of the iambic type with some admixture of dochmiacs and anapaests. In general the style of writing is less colloquial than in the *Cyclops*. If the exclamations are left out of account, the only obvious colloquialisms are *τουτί* (114) and *ναὶ μὰ Δία* (112)[4]. There is also less

[1] Apollod. 3. 115, and schol. Hom. Ω 256 follow the hymn in this respect: see however the *ἐκθεσις* to Pind. *Pyth.* p. 1, 12 Drachm., Serv. Verg. *Aen.* 4. 242.

[2] Perhaps he stole Apollo's bow and arrows as in Hor. *Carm.* 1. 10. 11 (no doubt after Alcaeus) *viduus pharetra | ridet Apollo*, schol. Hom. *l.c.*, Philostr. *imag.* 1. 26. The same suggestion is made by Kurfess in *Mnem.* XLI 111 f.

[3] Wilamowitz (p. 460) remarks that 'die harmlose Lustigkeit erfreulicher wirkt als der Witz des Euripides.'

[4] See however 38, 121 ff., 127, 136, 162, 255, 331, 393.

freedom in the metre of the iambics: Porson's canon is violated in 333, as against several more serious infringements in the *Cyclops*; and whereas eighteen instances of the licence admitting the introduction of the anapaest into other feet than the first have been counted in the *Cyclops*[1], there is only one—and that doubtful—in the *Ichneutae* (122). It is rather in the nature of the thoughts expressed than in respect to vocabulary or structure that the style deviates from the normal character of Sophoclean tragedy.

The appearance of fr. 294 N.[2] as v. 275 f. is conclusive evidence on the question of authorship. Wilamowitz specifies as marks of Sophoclean origin the use of *ὀλβίζειν* in 210, of *ἀπονοσφίζω* in 131, and of *εὖδειν* in 159; and to these should at least be added *νεωρής* in 150, and *μοῦνον* in 49. General impressions are less to be trusted, but I think that few will hesitate on consideration to acquiesce in the judgment of Wilamowitz, that the play reflects Sophocles' earlier manner, and that the occasional harshness and want of polish must be set down to *τὸ πικρὸν καὶ κατάτεχνον* which he himself recognized as a blemish of immaturity[2]. Some might go further and contend that there is here and there a tendency towards bombast which shows that he has not yet shaken himself free from the influence of Aeschylean *ὄγκος*; and it will be readily admitted that the harmonious blend of mellowness and lucidity to which he ultimately attained is hardly perceptible in these fragments. But Wilamowitz finds unmistakable signs of an early date in certain definite peculiarities of technique; that is to say, (1) there is no occasion for the presence of three actors on the stage at the same time; (2) no verse of the dialogue is broken between two speakers[3]; (3) the absence of strophic responsion from the opening chorus is comparable with similar features in the *Septem* and the *Eumenides*; (4) the alternation of lyrics with ordinary dialogue and stichomythia in the scene between Cyllene and the chorus finds its nearest parallel in the ultimately successful attempts of Athena to placate the Eumenides in the Aeschylean play[4].

It may be remarked in passing that the date of the *Cyclops* is

[1] Haigh, *Tragic Drama*, p. 391₃.
[2] Plut. *de virt. prof.* 7 p. 79 B.
[3] But see vv. 99, 199.
[4] If it is rightly inferred from Pacuvius (293 n.) that Euripides imitated this play in the *Antiope*, that circumstance would not assist the determination of the date, since it is certain that the *Antiope* was one of the latest plays (perhaps 408: Dieterich in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1266). Equally inconclusive is the argument which Wilamowitz deduces from the statement that Sophocles himself played the lyre in the *Thamyras* (p. 178), namely, that Sophocles took the part of Hermes, and that consequently the play must have belonged to his youth. Robert prefers to suppose for similar reasons that the poet represented Apollo.

quite uncertain, and has been fixed by some critics earlier than 438[1]. If that view were correct, the date of the *Ichneutae* would be put still further back; for the priority of the latter play is assured, apart from general considerations pointing the same way, by the freedom exercised by Euripides both in the division of his lines between two speakers, and in the employment of three actors during the same scene.

The action takes place on the barren slopes of Mt Cyllene, and the entrance to the cave of Maia was the central point to which the attention of the spectators was directed. Robert[2] has suggested that, since the early part of the play seems to indicate that no hut or cave was visible amid the mountain solitudes, Cyllene must be supposed to have suddenly appeared from an underground cavern[3] by means of the stage device known as Χαρώνιοι κλίμακες. The same critic holds that there was no back-scene, and that the πάγος was represented in the middle of the orchestra, as is supposed to have been the case with the *Supplices* of Aeschylus. But the scene of satyr-plays was for obvious reasons not infrequently located in the open country, and nothing is discernible with regard to the scenery of the *Ichneutae* which either supports or tells against the hypothesis of an early date.

From the technical point of view the discovery of a dialogue of some length composed in iambic tetrameter acatalectic metre (291 ff.) is remarkable. Nothing of the same kind is found elsewhere in Greek drama, but the iambic octonarii of Roman comedy furnish an exact parallel. In both cases the diaeresis at the end of the first dimeter is sometimes observed and sometimes neglected; the former type is the more frequent in Plautus, the latter in Terence. It is worthy of notice that both varieties occur in the Greek lyric fragments: contrast Alcm. fr. 9 with Alcae. fr. 56.

It is convenient at this point to call attention to an obscurity in the story of the play which awaits explanation. Part of the reward promised by Apollo to Silenus and the satyrs was the restoration of their freedom (57, 158), and it appears that in the sequel the promise was fulfilled (445). What then was the nature of their slavery? Wilamowitz[4] refers in this connexion to the obscure passage (218 ff.) in which Cyllene mentions their master as formerly wont to follow in the train of Dionysus, wearing the fawn-skin and wielding the thyrsus. He declines to guess at his identity, but conjectures that it was disclosed

[1] Kaibel in *Herm.* XXX 71 ff.
[2] *Herm.* XLVII 536 ff.
[3] See n. on v. 282, and J. E. Harrison, *l.c.* p. 159.
[4] p. 454.

on the occasion when the slaves were liberated. Nevertheless, he candidly admits that the audience do not seem to have required any explanation to be given concerning the slavery in question. Now it is true that, as in the *Cyclops* of Euripides, it was not uncommon for dramatic purposes to represent the satyrs as in the thrall of some ogre or demonic being, and it was obviously a useful expedient to account for their presence at the scene of action. Examples of such bondage are mentioned in the Introductory Notes to the *Amycus*, the *Heracles at Taenarum*, the *Cedalion*, and the *Pandora*. But it is scarcely credible that this kind of durance would have been employed as an element of the plot without a single word of explanation. Apollo expects to find the satyrs among the inhabitants of the countryside (35), and their slavery is apparently assumed as a matter of course. In such circumstances the natural inference would be that the satyrs here as elsewhere (*Cycl.* 709) are the slaves of Dionysus. This is the inference which Robert actually adopts; and he is obliged in consequence to assume that a line has been lost after 220. The hypothesis also involves the necessity of explaining why Silenus and the satyrs desired to be released from the joyous service of Dionysus. Robert recognizes the difficulty, and meets it by suggesting that the liberation of the chorus was a constant element in the *dénouement* of a satyr-play, and that, by an encroachment of the actual conditions of stage-management upon the story of the events enacted on the stage, the chorus were released at the end of the day's acting, *i.e.* after the production of the satyr-play, from their engagement to the Choregus or the Archon. That is the πόνος from which Silenus and the satyrs are here set free. In course of time, he thinks, the device staled, or the public became too fastidious to be satisfied with it; but, in order to sustain the custom, a mythological servitude (as in the *Cyclops*) was invented for each occasion. Whether this bold guess will meet with general acceptance, time will show; but it is by no means free from objection. One might be willing not to lay stress upon the fact that, if the text of 218 ff. is sound, the δεσπότης is distinguished from the god, but it is surely pertinent to enquire how Apollo could have promised to set free the bondsmen of Dionysus. He had received, so far as we know, no commission to that end, and it is idle to think of him as using his influence, unless indeed he represented Dionysus in some fuller sense than is usually recognized. But the relations of the satyrs with Apollo rather suggest that he himself is the master to whom their obedience must be rendered. Nor would it be altogether surprising that among the wooded hills of Arcadia

the satyrs should temporarily transfer their allegiance from the wine-god to the huntsman's patron deity[1]. We need not dwell on the fact that Apollo Nomios, the protector of flocks and herds, was known in Arcadia as the son of Silenus[2], except as evidence that in his rural aspect he did not disdain an association with the satyrs. That the satyrs should, at the bidding of the Hunter, assume the functions of keen-scented hounds[3], is in accordance with their constant fellowship with the huntsman Pan, as well as with their own proclivities[4]. None the less might they be expected to welcome the prospect of release from the obligation of service, which is held out as the reward of success on the present occasion[5]. Lastly, it may be observed that the subjection to Apollo is not necessarily inconsistent with the devotion which they owe to Dionysus. Besides the numerous points of contact between their worship[6], the gods themselves are identified by Euripides in the *Licymnius* (fr. 477): *δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε Βάκχε, παιὰν Ἄπολλον εὔλυρε.* And, if we are prepared to admit that Apollo was the *δεσπότης* of v. 218, it is not incredible that the god whom Aeschylus (fr. 341) addressed as *ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Βακχεύς, ὁ μάντις*, should wear the fawn-skin and wield the thyrsus at the head of the other members of the Bacchic rout[7].

314

Col. i

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ

[. . . . . .]ν ἀγγέλλω [β]ροτο[ῖς
[. . . . . δῶρ' ὑπισ]χνοῦμαι τελεῖ[ν

314. 1 αγγελω in αγγελλω corr. pap.[2]

314. 1 ff. Hunt supplies *πᾶσιν θεοῖς καὶ πᾶσιν* as the opening words of Apollo's speech, comparing vv. 10 and 14: somewhat less abrupt would be *ἀκούετ' ἤδη· πᾶσιν*. But since the conditions seem to demand that the new clause, of which *ὑπισχνοῦμαι* is the principal verb, should commence at the beginning of v. 2 (*τῷ τ' ἐξιχνευτῇ* Mekler), it is more likely that the object of *ἀγγέλλω* (*καινὸν μύθον* or the like) found its place in v. 1. The opening of the *Alcestis* shows that it is not necessary to suppose that the name of Apollo appeared in v. 3, and *ἀπόπροθεν* rather requires some such supplement as Mekler's *χρυσᾶ κλαπεισῶν μοι βοῶν*. Rossbach, accepting v. 1 as restored in the *ed. pr.*, supplies *τόδ' ἔργον ἠδὲ δ.* in 2, and *εἴτ' ἐγγύθεν τις εἶδεν εἴτ'* in 3. But the result is unsatisfactory. It is not absolutely certain that v. 1 was the first of the play (see cr. n. on v. 94); but Hunt gives good reasons for considering it probable.

[1] For Apollo *ἀγρευτής* see *O.C.* 1091, Herond. 3. 34 *Ἄπολλον ἀγρεῦ*, Jebb on Bacchyl. 15. 6.
[2] Clem. Alex. *protr.* 2. 28, p. 24 P., Porphyr. *vit. Pyth.* 18, Cic. *n.d.* 3. 57.
[3] Pollux 5. 10. [4] *Anth. Pal.* 11. 194, 4. [5] 68 ff.
[6] See Wernicke in Pauly Wissowa II 35.
[7] For further discussion of the various points involved see n. on 218 ff.

[. . . . . ἀ]πόπροθεν·
[. . . .]ον[. . . . . δύσ]λοφον φρενὶ
[. . . .]τα[. . . . . βο]ῦς ἀμολγάδας
[μόσ]χους [. . . . .]α πορτίδων
[. . .] . ταφρ[. . . . .]ν ἰχνοσκοπῶ
[λαθ]ραῖ' ἰόν[τ . . . . . βου]στάθμου κάπης
[ἀφα]νῶς τεχνα[. . . . . ἐ]γὼ οὐκ ἂν ᾠόμην
[οὔτ' ἄ]ν θεῶν τιν[' οὔτ' ἐφημ]έρων βροτῶν
[δρᾶσ]αι τόδ' ἔργ[ον ὧδε] πρὸς τόλμαν πεσεῖν.
[ταῦτ]' οὖν ἐπείπερ [ἔμα]θον, ἐκπλαγεὶς ὄκνῳ

5 α[in marg. add. pap.^{2} **7** διασ[in marg. add. pap.^{2} **8** in marg. adscripta λα[supra ον ην[| *ἰόντα τῆλε* Hunt: fort. *ἰόντων* **9** *τέχναισιν· ὡς* Hunt: fort. *τεχνάσματ'· ἀλλ'* **11** *τόλμην* pap.

4 ff. 'Something like *δεινὸν γὰρ ἔστ' ἐμῇ δὲ δύσλοφον* may have stood in l. 4' (Hunt). But the connexion with the following line is doubtful, and the acc. *βοῦς* seems to require for its government a verb of *stealing* or *losing*. The latter is perhaps the easier to work in: *e.g.* *δεινὸν γὰρ ἄλγος ἠδὲ δύσλοφον φρενὶ* (so Mekler) | *ἔπεστ' ἀφαιρεθέντι*. Hunt is probably right in supposing that the cattle are divided as 'milch-kine,' calves, and heifers, but the restoration of v. 6 is not easy. The conjectures of Wilamowitz *τε καὶ νέων νόμευμα* (perhaps too long) and *νεανίευμα* are condemned by their halting metre, and Mekler's *τε πῖόν τ' ἀγλάισμα* is not convincing.

7 ff. are restored by Wilamowitz thus: *ἅπαντα φροῦδα καὶ μάτην... | λαθραῖ' ἰόντα τῆλε*. Murray suggests *τάφρων· ὕπερθε νῦν* in v. 7. I should prefer *ἔπειτ' ἀφρούρων ἁρπαγήν* (cf. Ovid's *incustoditae*). Hunt supplies *τέχναισιν· ὡς* in v. 9, but the dative is somewhat harsh without any previous mention of the agents. Perhaps we should read *λαθραῖ' ἰόντων...τεχνάσματ'· ἀλλ'*, and render: 'the stealthy artifices of men who have travelled unseen far from the byre.' *ἀλλά* is more suitable than *ὡς* to the sequence of thought.—**ἂν ᾠόμην | οὔτ' ἂν...πεσεῖν.** It may be that the first *ἄν* belongs to *ᾠόμην*, and the second to *πεσεῖν*, but it is certain that both do not belong to *ᾠόμην*, although both may belong to *πεσεῖν*. Cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 524 *τάδε γὰρ εἰπεῖν τὴν πανοῦργον...οὐκ ἂν ᾠόμην ἐν ἡμῖν | οὐδὲ τολμῆσαί ποτ' ἄν*. See the discussion of this question in the n. on Eur. *Hel.* 1619. In Lys. 31. 1 *ἄν* clearly goes with the infinitive; and *O. C.* 748, Antiph. 3 γ 1, id. 5. 69, Thuc. 8. 66, Xen. *mem.* 3. 4. 7, Dem. 9. 68, Plat. *Theaet.* 144 A, as well as Eur. *Her.* 1355, seem to require a similar explanation. But I would again put forward the suggestion that in such cases the influence of *ἄν* may extend to both verbs; and this must be so in Plat. *rep.* 443 E *εἰ δέοι ἡμᾶς ἀνομολογεῖσθαι...τὶν' ἂν οἷει οἰηθῆναι τοῦτο αὐτὸν δρᾶσαι;* and in Xen. *mem.* 1. 5. 1, unless we are prepared to admit that *οἶομαι* may be followed by an aorist infinitive representing future time.

11 τόλμαν: see cr. n. The evidence of our MSS is strongly in favour of the forms *τόλμα* and *τόλμαν* in tragedy, and they are confirmed by metre. On the other hand *τόλμην* is unsupported, although it was recognized by Phrynichus (p. 114, 20 de B.=Bekk. *anecd.* p. 66, 23).—**πεσεῖν.** The nearest parallel in Sophocles is *Trach.* 705 *ὥστ' οὐκ ἔχω τάλαινα ποῖ γνώμης πέσω*. Euripides uses *πεσεῖν ἐς* c. acc. more freely, generally as a periphrasis expressing somewhat more forcibly what might have been rendered by the aor. inf. of the verb corresponding to the abstract noun (*τολμῆσαι, ἐρασθῆναι*, etc.). So *εἰς ἔρωτα πίπτειν* (='to fall in love') Eur. fr. 138, and c. gen. *I. T.* 1172, *Bacch.* 812; *ἐς φόβον πεσόντε Phoen.* 69; *εἰς ἔριν πίπτειν* fr. 578. Occasionally it may be held that *πεσεῖν* retains the sense of *to yield* or *give way*, as in Eur. *El.* 982 *εἰς ἀνανδρίαν πεσεῖν* or *Or.* 696 *εἰς ὀργὴν πεσεῖν* (contrast Tr. fr. adesp. 80).

[ζητ]ῶ ματεύω, παντελὲς κήρυγμ' ἔχων
[θεοῖ]ς βροτοῖς τε μηδέν' ἀγνοεῖν τάδε·
[. . . . .]υθία γὰρ ἐμμανὴς κυνηγετῶ.
[. . . . .]ων δ' ἐπῆλθ[ο]ν φ[ῦ]λα τ[οῦ] παντὸς στρατ[οῦ
[. . . . .]τισ[. . . . .] . [
. . . . . .
[ ]σ[
[. . . . .]λ[ ]κιο[
[. . . . .]ισ[ἔ]πειτα [δὲ
[τ]ὰ Θεσσαλῶν [ἐ]πεσσύθ[ην
Βοιωτίας τε γ[ῆς . . . . .]ς [πό]λ[εις,
[ἔπει]τα δ['] . [
. . . . . .

desunt versus fere quattuor

Col. ii [. . . . .]ς Δωρικο[
[. . . . . γεί]τον', ἔνθ[εν

13 ζητῶ Wilamowitz : στείχω Hunt | ματεύω ex ματεύων corr. pap. **14** τάδε : ο (*i.e.* τόδε) suprascr. pap.[2] **15** εμμανὶς ex εμμανεις corr. pap. **16**]τον in marg. add. pap.[2] **18** sqq. cum ex duobus fragmentis confecta sint, de singulorum sede minus constat **22** ο^{υ} (*i.e.* οὕτως) habet in marg. pap. post v. 23 desunt fere quattuor versus

13 **ζητῶ ματεύω**: for the rhetorical asyndeton see on Eur. *Phoen.* 1193. Diehl, quoting *O. C.* 211, thinks that ματεύων (cr. n.) may be right.—**παντελὲς** is perhaps rather *authoritative* than *universal*: that is to say, it may be compared with *Ant.* 1163 λαῶν τε χώρας παντελῆ μοναρχίαν.—**κήρυγμ' ἔχων** = κηρύσσων: see on fr. 210, 48. As a verb of commanding it is followed by the inf. with μή: the form of the proclamation was μηδεὶς ἀγνοείτω. Cf. *Ant.* 192 ff.

15 Wilamowitz ingeniously supplied ἀκολουθίᾳ from fr. 990, as if ἀκολουθία were the equivalent of δίωξις. The use of the word in hunting may be inferred from Xen. *Cynег.* 10. 5, where reading and interpretation are alike doubtful. So far as the sense goes, Murray's δυσπειθία is to be preferred. πολυπειθία might also be suggested: 'distracted by varying rumours.'

16–30 described Apollo's journey to Cyllene. Accident has preserved the geographical names which establish this, and little or nothing beyond. The remnants of vv. 18—23 are contained in two separate fragments: for their position see Hunt's note. The herds of the god which Hermes plundered were grazing in Pieria, according to *h. Herm.* 70 and Apollod. 3. 112. At any rate, Thessaly was the traditional scene, and Anton. Lib. 23 describes them as being in the same pastures as the herds of Admetus. Therefore it is extremely unlikely that Sophocles put them anywhere else. If so, there does not seem to be any good reason for introducing the name of Thrace or of the Thracians into these lines, and I hesitate to accept Wilamowitz's Θρᾳκῶν in 16 with ἀλλ' οὕτως in 17, or Hunt's alternative Θρηικο- in 19 with σπευδων in 16. In any case, the combination Θρᾳκῶν φῦλα τοῦ π. στρατοῦ, 'the tribes of the whole host of Thracians,' is a clumsy one, and I should prefer to begin with ἀνδρῶν (or βροτῶν) and to take τοῦ παντὸς στρατοῦ with what follows, adopting (cr. gr.) Murray's ζητῶν τιν. For στρατὸς = λεώς see Jebb on *Trach.* 795.

21 f. Hunt printed the supplements of Wilamowitz Θεσσαλῶν τ' ἔγναρπα πεδί' and γῆς πολεστήτους.

28 **Δωρικο-** no doubt marks the passage to the Peloponnese. Similarly

[. . . . .] ἥκω ξυν[.]α.[
[. . . . . Κυλ]λήνης τε δύ[σβατον
[. . . . .] τε χῶρον ἐς δ' ὑ[
[ὡς εἴτε ποι]μὴν εἴτ' ἀγρωστή[ρων τις ἢ
[μαριλοκαυ]τῶν ἐν λόγῳ παρ[ίσταται
[ἢ τῶν ὀρ]είων νυμφογεννή[του γένους
[θηρῶ]ν τίς ἐστι, πᾶσιν ἀγγέλ[λω τάδε,
[. . . .]ωρα τοῦ Παιῶνος ὅστις ἃ[ν λάβῃ,
[. . . .] . τὸ χρῆμα μισθός ἐσθ' ὁ κε[ίμενος.

32]θ[in marg. add. pap.^{2} **34** *μαριλοκαυτῶν* suppl. Wilamowitz |]ν in marg. add. pap.^{2} **37** *τὸν φῶρα τῶν* (*τῶν* Wilamowitz) Hunt: fort. *τὰ ἕλωρα* **38** *τῷδ' αὐτόχρημα* Hunt

Anton. Lib. 23, after making Hermes pass through Boeotia (v. 22) and Megaris, brings him directly to the Peloponnese by way of Corinth. For the adjective cf. *O. C.* 695 *ἐν τᾷ μεγάλᾳ Δωρίδι νάσῳ Πέλοπος*. The schol. on *O. T.* 775 interprets *Δωρὶς* as *Πελοποννησιακή*.

30 Mekler plausibly suggests *ξὺν τάχει*.

32 f. Wilamowitz was scarcely justified in altering *ἐς* to *εἰ*: *εἰ δ' ὑληβάτης ἐνταῦθα ποιμήν*. Unless, however, *δ'* is an error for *θ'*, which the marginal comment (cr. n.) by no means proves, a new sentence must begin here, which it is not easy to adjust agreeably with the context. Some case or compound of *ὕλη* seems inevitable, but would require a qualification. There does not seem to be enough room in 33 for *ἐς δ' ὕλην μολὼν | τήνδ' εἴτε κτέ.*—It is unnecessary to omit the *σ* of *ἀγρωστήρων*, although there is no other example of the form. For *ἀγρώστης*: *ἀγρώτης* see on fr. 94.

34 μαριλοκαυτῶν, a brilliant conjecture of Wilamowitz from fr. 1067.—**ἐν λόγῳ παρίσταται**, 'is at hand to hear my words,' supports the soundness of the MS reading in *Phil.* 319 *τοῖσδε μάρτυς ἐν λόγοις*, which has been the object of some suspicion.

35 νυμφογεννήτου. For the relationship between nymphs and satyrs see Hes. fr. 44 Rz. *ἐξ ὧν* (sc. the daughters of Hekateros [?] and the daughter of Phoroneus) *οὔρειαι Νύμφαι θεαὶ ἐξεγένοντο, | καὶ γένος οὐτιδανῶν Σατύρων καὶ ἀμηχανοεργῶν*. Here satyrs and nymphs are children of the same parents, but the anonymous satyr-play published in *Ox. Pap.* VIII 63 (fr. 1, 7) agrees with the present passage, describing the satyrs as *παῖδες δὲ νυμφῶν, Βακχίου δ' ὑπηρέται*. Silenus, the lover of the nymphs (*inf.* 149), is their father. Yet satyrs are sometimes themselves joined in wedlock with nymphs (Ov. *Fast.* 3. 409); while the Sileni are children of the Naiads (Xen. *symp.* 5. 7). In Nonn. 14. 113 the satyrs are the sons of Hermes and Iphthime, the daughter of Dorus. See further on 218 ff.

37 The obvious supplement *τὸν φῶρα* does not fit *τοῦ Παιῶνος*, and Wilamowitz substituted *τῶν* for *τοῦ* in consequence. But it is not satisfactory to alter the text in order to justify even so plausible a restoration of the lost letters. Hunt suggests *τὰ δῶρα...ἄρνυται* as an alternative, but admits that *τὰ δῶρα* scarcely fills the gap. It is perhaps possible that *θἄλωρα* (written *τὰ ἕλωρα*) might stand here: cf. Hom. Σ 93.—*Παιών* as well as *Παιάν* (*O. T.* 154) is a familiar *ἐπίκλησις* of Apollo: for an attempt to connect it with Paeonia see *C. R.* XXVI 249. It is worth remarking that Usener (*Götternamen*, p. 154) found in Sophocles the earliest identification of Paion and Apollo. But it is curious that Apollo should refer to himself by this title, especially as the circumstances have no connexion with his functions as the Healer.

38 *τῷδ' αὐτόχρημα* was restored by Hunt, but *αὐτόχρημα* does not mean 'forthwith,' and is not obviously appropriate to the context. For its special use to mark a pun (like *ἐτύμως* etc.) see Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 78. Probably then we should recognize another instance of *τὸ χρῆμα*, used vaguely as in 44 and 136, and preceded by a participle such as *ἀνύσας* or even *εὑρών*.

ΣΙΛΗΝΟΣ

[ἔα· τὰ] σοῦ φωνήμαθ' ὡς ἐπέκλυον
[βοῶ]ντος ὀρθίοισι σὺν κηρύγμασ[ι,
[σ]πουδῇ τάδ' ἢ πάρεστι πρεσβύτῃ [μαθών,
[σ]οί, Φοῖβ' Ἄπολλον, προσφιλὴς εὐε[ργέτης
θέλων γενέσθαι τῷδ' ἐπεσσύθην δρ[όμῳ,]
ἄν πως τὸ χρῆμα τοῦτό σοι κυνηγ[έ]σω.
τ[ὸ] γὰρ γέ[ρα]ς μοι κείμενον χρ[υ]σο[σ]τεφὲ[ς]
μά[λι]στ' ἐπ[ιστολ]αῖσ[ι π]ροσθέσθ[αι χρεών,
παῖδας δ' ἐμ[οὺ]ς ὄσσοισι [...]ανε[.]βα[..]. [....]
.[.....]'[.]ν εἴπερ ἐκτε[λ]εῖς ἅπερ λέγεις.

39 ἔα· τὰ suppl. Mekler **45** sq. supplevi **47** ὀσσοισι ex οσσοισι corr. pap.[2]

39 ἔα· τά. I have accepted Mekler's supplement (see cr. n.), since ὦ Φοῖβε of the *ad. pr.* is admittedly too long, and is not required so shortly before 42. For the unusual position of the pronoun see Kuehner-Gerth § 464, 4 anm. 2.

41 σπουδῇ with its relative clause belongs to *ἐπεσσύθην*, and the hyperbaton of *τάδε*, which of course goes with *μαθών*, need cause no difficulty. There is a similar case in *O. T.* 1251 *χὤπως μὲν ἐκ τῶνδ' οἴκετ' οἶδ' ἀπόλλυται*: see also on Eur. *Hel.* 719.

44 κυνηγίσω: cf. 75 *ἐκυνηγέσαι*. If these forms come from *κυνηγεῖν*, a verb not found in any text earlier than Aristotle, the short vowel is very remarkable, and they must be added to the list which contains *αἰνέσω*, *καλέσω*, *ποθέσω*, *ποιέσω* and others. Several of these are usually explained as analogical products (*ἐκάλεσα*: *ἐτέλεσα*); see Weir Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, p. 489 ff., Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.* IV pp. 296, 380. Another suggestion, however, has been put forward by P. Maas (*B. ph. W.* 1912, 1075) on the strength of two statements by grammarians, which Lobeck (*Paralip.* p. 438) refused to credit. See Phryn. *praep. soph.* p. 84, 1 de B. *κυνηγετῆσαι* (rightly, as it now seems, corrected to *κυνηγέτησαι* by Buttmann)· *διὰ διοῖν τῶν λέγουσιν*. The gnost. ap. Cram. *anecd. Ox.* II p. 143, 10 *τὰ διὰ τοῦ εσσω ῥήματα, πιρέσσω, ἑρέσσω, ἀηθέσσω, κυνηγέσσω*. Maas points out the exact parallelism between *ἑρέσσαι* (Hom. *μ* 444): *ἑρέτης*, *εἰρεσίη*: *ἑρέσσειν* and *κυνηγέσαι*: *κυνηγέτης*, *κυνηγέσιον*: *κυνηγέσσειν*. We must, therefore, conclude that Sophocles employed the older *κυνηγέσσειν* as well as the newer formation *κυνηγετεῖν* (*Ai.* 5), which in its turn gave way to *κυνηγεῖν*.

45 ff. The sequence of thought appears to be, 'I am ready to assist; for I expect my services to be well rewarded. And my sons shall aid ..., if only you will keep your promise.' The speaker's object is to bring Apollo to business. In this sense I have endeavoured to restore 45 f.; *τὸ γὰρ γέρας* was admitted by Hunt to be a possible reading, but was rejected as unsuitable. For the palaeographical details his note must be consulted. 47 f. are a puzzling problem: if the elision mark in 48 is rightly deciphered, an optative (e.g. *στείλαιμ' ἄν*) is possible.—'Above all, your behests must be enlarged by the secure reward for me of a golden crown.' **κείμενον**: the word must be understood as in *Ant.* 485 *εἰ ταῦτ' ἀναῖ τῇδε κείσεται κράτη* (Jebb's n.). The prize was fixed or secured for the winner: Pind. *Isth.* 1. 26 *ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ ἔργματι κεῖτο τέλος*, where *τέλος* is equivalent to *γέρας* here. The text of the MS *χ[.]ῃ .[..]τεφε* (and the possibility that another letter follows) perhaps represents an original *χρυσεοστεφεῖ*, as *χρισεοστεφάνων* appears in some MSS of Pind. *Ol.* 8. 1. In that passage *χρυσεο-* is figurative, *i.e.* it expresses the supreme worth of the not intrinsically valuable prizes. Here *χρυσεο-* is literal, and the second member of the compound figurative: the satyrs looked for some reward more solid than a wreath. The ironical application of the compound is well suited to the tone of the passage; cf. 72, 156, 202.—*ἐπ' ἐντολαῖσι* is also possible: cf. *Trach.* 1253.

ΑΠ. [. . . . .] . [.]ω· μοῦνον ἐμπ[έδου τ]άδ[ε.
ΣΙ. τὰ[ς βοῦς ἀπάξω σ]οι· σὺ δ' ἐμπέδου [δόσι]ν.
ΑΠ. [ἔξει σφ' ὁ γ' εὖ]ρὼν ὅστις ἔσθ' · ἑτ[οῖ]μ[α] δέ.
ΣΙ. [. . . . .]ισ . . [. ε[.]ζητ[. . . . .
ΑΠ. [. . . . .]εσο . [
Col. iii ΣΙ. [ ]
ΑΠ. [. . .] . α[
ΣΙ. τί τοῦτο; πο[ι . . . . . λέγ]εις;
ΑΠ. ἐλεύθερος σὺ [πᾶν τε γένος ἔσται τέκ]νων.

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΣΑΤΥΡΩΝ

ἴθ' ἄγε . [. . . . . .
πόδα βά[σιν τε . . . . .]ν
ἀπαπαπ[αῖ . . . . .]
ὦ ὤ, σέ τοι [. . . . .]
ἔπιθι κλωπ[. . . . .]
ὑπόνομα κ[. . . . .]
διανύτων ὁ[. . . . .]
πατρικὰν γᾶρ[υν . . . . .]
πῶς πᾷ τὰ λάθρι[α νύχια

52 ἀλλ]ότρια γ̣[in marg. add. pap.[2] **59** τὰ ἴχν(η) in marg. add. pap.[2]
65 γῆρ[υν pap. **66** δ]ιανυχ(ια) a Theone primitus scriptum in marg. add. pap.[2]

49 σπουδὴν ἐπαινῶ might give the sense required.—Observe the Sophoclean μοῦνον (fr. 852 n.).

50 δόσιν: H. Richards conjectures λόγον, which would correspond to ὅρκον ἐμπεδώσομεν in *I. T.* 790. Some less obvious restoration is then required in 51.

51 ἑτοῖμα, without definite reference ('everything is prepared'), is idiomatic. See Thuc. 2. 3, 10, 98 etc.

56 πολὺν δωρεὰν ἄλλην is supplied by Hunt (*ed. min.*).

57 For the servitude of the chorus see Introductory Note.

58 ff. The remains of the choral ode are too slight to reveal the general character of the metre, but dochmiacs are clearly recognizable in 68, 69 and 72. There is a certain degree of similarity to Eur. *Cycl.* 656 ff. Robert holds that the chorus entered σποράδην before the dialogue with Apollo was completed, and that they heard his concluding directions: see on 102.

61 σέ τοι is a common combination in addresses, with λέγω or the like following: *Ai.* 359, 1228, *El.* 1445, *O. C.* 1578. The governing verb is omitted in Ar. *Av.* 274.

63 ὑπόνομα seems to be used metaphorically (=*cunning*). The transference is attested by Hesych. IV p. 215 ὑπονομαί· κλοπαί· ὀχετοί.

65 πατρικὰν γᾶρυν, 'our father's voice,' corresponds to πατρικὸς λόγος in Plat. *soph.* 242 A (the argument of Parmenides).—The MS has γῆρυν here and in 290, but ἐγάρυσε in 244. Several other instances of η where α might have been expected occur (237, 283, 321), and I have followed Hunt (*ed. min.*) in restoring the Doric form. The difficult question relating to the trustworthiness of our MSS in this respect is thoroughly discussed by Tucker on Aesch. *Cho.* pp. 246—250.

κλέμματα ποσσὶ [. . . . . .]
εἴ πως, ἂν τύχω, πο . [. . . . . .]
πατρί τ' ἐλεύθερον β[. .] . . μετ[.]
ξὺν ἅμα θεὸς ὁ φίλος ἀνέτω
πόνους προφήνας
ἀρίζηλα χρυσοῦ παραδείγματα.
Σι. θεοὶ Τύχη [κ]αὶ δαῖμον ἰθυντήριε,
τυχ[ε]ῖν με πράγους οὗ δράμημ' ἐπείγεται,

68 post hunc v. paragraphum habet pap. **70** litteras σοφιλοσανετω add. pap.^{2} et ξυν ex συν corr. **72** ἀρίζηλα in fine v. 71 pap. **73** ε[. .]ιντηριε ap^r in marg. add. pap.^{2} **74** πράγους ex πραγος corr. pap.^{2}

67 ποσσί is less remarkable than πόδεσι (fr. 240 n.).—The supplement required may have been (*ex. gr.*) συμπεράνας ἔχει.

69 is not easily to be restored (see Hunt's n.), more particularly as it is not clear whether the words are connected with the following lines, which are themselves not altogether intelligible, and may be corrupt, as Wilamowitz thinks (p. 455$_5$).—βιοῦν μέτα, Diehl.

70 ff. Taking the text as it stands, I would interpret as follows: 'Now that our god has displayed splendid prizes of gold, let him therewithal at our side conclude our labours.' The gold is secure,—a first favour; next, let the quest be short. I write ξὺν ἅμα (rather than συνάμα, which belongs to the Hellenistic age) as the rough breathing of the papyrus seems to indicate, although it might, of course, be an instance of medial aspiration (fr. 582 n.). ξύν is then adverbial, as elsewhere in Sophocles (*Ant.* 85 etc.); and ἅμα accompanies the participial clause, as in Xen. *Anab.* 3. 1. 47 καὶ ἅμα ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἀνίστη and other examples quoted by Kuehner-Gerth II 82. —**ἀρίζηλα**, used in the larger sense of what is not merely clear, but conspicuous or striking. θαυμαστὴ ἄγαν is Hesych.'s gloss on ἀριζήλη (I p. 280), perhaps in reference to Hom. Σ 319. ἀριζήλωτος shows that the word was influenced by ζῆλος, although etymologically distinct from it. L. and S.'s account is defective. — **παραδείγματα**, here simply things shown, exhibits. Strictly, we must distinguish the derived meanings (1) *example*, as in *O. T.* 1193, and (2) *sample*, as in Ar. *Pax* 65.

73 Τύχη is personified as in *O. T.* 1080 ἐγὼ δ' ἐμαυτὸν παῖδα τῆς Τύχης νέμων | τῆς εὖ διδούσης. Fortune is not here invoked as blind chance contrasted with foresight, although the first beginnings of that sense are to be found in Attic poetry (*O. T.* 977, *Ant.* 1158). Rather, she is the divine power to which all human action is subservient, daughter of Prometheia, as Alcman calls her (fr. 62), mightiest of the fates according to Pindar (fr. 41). Cf. Tr. fr. adesp. 506 πάντων τύραννος ἡ τύχη 'στι τῶν θεῶν κτέ. Thus the vague δαῖμον ἰθυντήριε should not be understood as referring to Apollo, but as a further description of the same guiding force. Cf. Dio Chrys. 63. 7 οἱ δὲ πηδάλιον ἔδωκαν κρατεῖν (sc. τῇ τύχῃ). . . τὸ δὲ πηδάλιον δηλοῖ ὅτι κυβερνᾷ τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον ἡ τύχη. id. 64. 5. Observe also that the worship of ἀγαθὸς δαίμων was intimately associated at Athens with that of ἀγαθὴ τύχη; see Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1088, J. E. Harrison, *Themis*, p. 278, and cf. Pausan. 9. 39. 5.—For the marginal variant see cr. n. I believe that Aristophanes wrote εὐθυντήριε rather than εἰθυντήριε, as restored in the *ed. pr.* For the constant confusion of εὐθύνω and ἰθύνω and of their cognates, see Eur. *Hipp.* 1227, Blomfield on Aesch. *Pers.* 779. Recent critics (*e.g.* Nauck on Aesch. fr. 200) have inclined to restore the forms in εὐ-.

74 τυχεῖν: for the exclamatory infinitive in prayers see Goodw. § 785, Kuehner-Gerth II 19 ff., Tucker on Aesch. *Theb.* 139.—**οὗ**: the genitive expresses the object at which an aim is directed or towards which desire moves. The connexion with ἐπείγεσθαι is Homeric: α 309 ἐπειγόμενός περ ὁδοῖο, Τ 142 ἐπειγόμενός περ Ἄρηος.

λείαν ἄγραν σύλη[σ]ιν ἐκκυνηγέσαι
Φ[ο]ίβου κλ[ο]παίας βοῦς ἀπεστερημένο[υ.
[τ]ῶν εἴ τις ὀπτήρ ἐστι[ν] ἢ κατήκοος,
[ἐ]μοί τ' [ἃ]ν [ϵ]ἴη προσφιλὴς φράσας τόδε,
[Φοίβῳ τ]' ἄνακτι παντελὴς εὐεργ[έ]της.
[. . . . .]α[. .]τ[. .]ς τοῦ λό[γο]υ θ' ἅμα[
Col. iv μήνυ[τρα
ΧΟ. ἰὼ σ[
ὑπο[
δ' οὐδ[
ΣΙ. φησίν τις, ἢ [
ἔοικεν ἤδη κ[
ἄγ' εἶα δὴ πᾶς σ[
ῥινηλατῶν ὀσμ[αῖσι
αὔρας ἐάν πῃ πρ[
διπλοῦς ὀκλάζω[ν . . . . .]ν

77 λ[in marg. add. pap.^{2} **78** τ'...φράσας Wilamowitz: γ' . . δράσας pap. | τόδε: α (*i.e.* τάδε) suprascr. pap.^{2} Hunt **79** παντελὴς scripsi: προστελὴς pap., συντελὴς

75 λείαν *κτέ.* The asyndeton is no doubt intended to emphasize the climax (Kuehner-Gerth II 341).—It may be questioned whether *σύλησιν* is here concrete, or whether λείαν and ἄγραν are to be taken, as is quite possible, as *nomina actionis*. On the whole, the idea of discovering the stolen cattle seems to be more prominent than that of punishing the theft. In fact, an abstract noun is sometimes employed, where we should require a concrete: see on Eur. *Hel.* 50, 1675.

77 τῶν is demonstrative. Cf. *O. T.* 200 *τόν...ὑπὸ σῷ φθίσον κεραυνῷ*.

78 φράσας (see cr. n.) seems to be a necessary correction.

79 *προστελὴς* (see cr. n.) does not occur elsewhere, and has no obvious meaning. It seems probable, therefore, that the preposition has been copied by mistake from the previous line. Hunt substitutes *συντελὴς*, 'contributory,' which may well be right, unless we should prefer the more complimentary *παντελὴς* ('all-effective'). It may be observed that Aeschylus and Sophocles (if we include v. 13) each use the word *παντελὴς* four times, but it is never employed by Euripides or by Pindar.

80 f. The purport of these lines was to promise the informer a share of the reward.

85 f. are well restored by Hunt: *φησίν τις, ἢ οὐδεὶς φησιν εἰδέναι τάδε; | ἔοικεν ἤδη καὶ πρὸς ἔργ' ὀρμᾶν με δεῖν*. He quotes Eur. *I. T.* 1072.

87 ἄγ' εἶα supports the reading of the MSS in Ar. *Ran.* 394, where several editors adopt Bentley's ἀλλ' *εἶα*, as well as V's reading in *Plut.* 316.—For the aspiration, which is said to be Attic, see schol. A on Hom. I 262 *τῆς δασείας Ἀττικῶς προσελθούσης*. Cf. 168, fr. 221, 4.

89 αὔρας, evidently with the meaning *scent*. Cf. Antiph. fr. 217, 22 (II 105 K.) *ξανθαῖσιν αὔραις σῶμα πᾶν ἀγάλλεται*, *i.e.* with the savour of roasting.

90 διπλοῦς ὀκλάζων I should interpret as 'bent double.' Terzaghi supplies *πόδας* with διπλοῦς, but the chorus are not exhorted merely to bend their *legs*. Silenus encourages them to bend over the track, but it seems from 119 that they exaggerated his command by moving along the trail on all-fours. For διπλοῦς in this sense cf. Eur. *El.* 492 *διπλῆν ἄκανθαν καὶ παλίρροπον γόνυ*. Verg. *Aen.* II. 645

ὕποσμος ἐν χρῷ . [. . . . . .]
οὕτως ἔρευναν καὶ π[. . . . . .]
ἅπαντα χρηστὰ κα[ὶ . . . . . τε]λεῖν.
ΗΜΙΧ. θεὸς θεὸς θεὸς θεός· ἔα [ἔα·
ἔχειν ἔοιγμεν· ἴσχε· μὴ . ρ[. . . .]τει.
ΗΜΙΧ. ταῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνα τῶν β[οῶ]ν τ[ὰ] βήματα.
ΗΜΙΧ. σίγ[α]· θεός τις τὴν ἀποι[κία]ν ἄγει.
ΗΜΙΧ. τί δρῶμεν, ὦ τᾶν; ἦ τὸ δέον [ἄρ'] ἤνομεν;
τί; τοῖσ[ι] ταύτῃ πῶς δοκεῖ;

93 χρῆσθαι a Theone scriptum in marg. add. pap.[2] **94** ἄ in marg. centesimo versui adscriptum | alterum ἔα add. Wilamowitz **96** βήματα P. Maas: σήματα olim Hunt (littera prima in pap. evanida) **97** σιγ add. pap.[2] et paragraphum infra positum del. **98** sqq. secundum Wilamowitzium distributi, nisi quod ille chorum trifariam divisit. paragraphos post vv. 98, 99 (bis), 103, 104 habet pap. | ετιδ in rasura pap.[2], tum ε delevit (ἔτιδρ[ω][. .]τι[χ] in marg. add. pap.[2]) | ἄρ' ἤνομεν Murray: ἐξήνομεν Wilamowitz

duplicatque virum transfixa dolore (sc. *hasta*). 12. 926 *incidit ictus* | *ingens ad terram duplicato poplite Turnus.* ὀκλάζειν signifies *to crouch*, although no doubt it is often applied specifically to squatting on the haunches. Wilamowitz, who reads δίπους, thinks that ὀκλάζων should refer to a dog sitting; but how could he then follow the trail?

91 **ὕποσμος ἐν χρῷ**, scenting closely, *i.e.* with their noses close to the ground. Cf. Arist. *de an.* 2. 9. 421[b] 11 καὶ γὰρ τούτων ἔνια (*i.e.* some water animals) πόρρωθεν ἁπαντᾷ πρὸς τὴν τροφὴν ὕποσμα γινόμενα, —guided by the smell. ὑπήκοος is exactly parallel. The gloss of Hesych. IV p. 216 ὕποσμος· ὀσφραινόμενος is substantially correct, and may very well, as Wilamowitz thinks, refer to this passage. Cf. Phot. *lex.* p. 630, 14 ὕποσμος· ὁ ὑπονοῶν τι καὶ ὑποπτεύων. For ἐν χρῷ cf. Thuc. 2. 84 ἐν χρῷ ἀεὶ παραπλέοντες (ἀντὶ τοῦ πλησίον schol.).

94 **θεός** is repeated to mark the excitement. Wilamowitz refers to Eur. *Hel.* 560 ὦ θεοί· θεὸς γὰρ καὶ τὸ γιγνώσκειν φίλους, a passage which shows that even so impersonal a conception as the articular infinitive can be described as θεός. So here θεός is equivalent to θεῖόν τι ἔστιν ἐνταῦθα.

95 μὴ πρόσω πάτει, which I formerly suggested, is found to be too long for the gap. Robert has made the same correction independently.

96 Hunt (*ed. min.*) accepted **βήματα** from P. Maas: see cr. n. Maas also required ἐκείνων for **ἐκεῖνα**, as in 110. But ἐκεῖνα ('here are those steps') is more forcible, and would not be precluded even if it were certain that βήματα or ἴχνη had not previously been mentioned. Cf. *El.* 1115 τοῦτ' ἐκεῖν' ἤδη σαφὲς | πρόχειρον ἄχθος...δέρκομαι, *ib.* 1178 τόδ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο.—I have followed Hunt in the distribution of these lines: Wilamowitz divides the chorus into three sections, for reasons which will be discussed in the n. on 168. Robert, who divides into ἡμιχόρια, discovers three separate speakers in each section, and so finds an argument in favour of the view that the satyric chorus always consisted of 12 members. The tradition is against these subdivisions, but the correct apportionment of the speeches is necessarily doubtful.

97 The exact allusion which is intended is probably irrecoverable. Something in the attitude of the chorus seems to have suggested to their minds the formalities observed on the occasion of the departure of a new colony. Or, as Wilamowitz suggests, they may have been thinking of Cadmus following the cow, or the Theraeans entering Cyrene behind the raven. In any case, **θεός** must refer to Apollo as the god of colonization, particularly under his title of ἀρχηγέτης. Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 5. 60, Thuc. 6. 3.

98 See cr. n. *O. T.* 157 does not defend ἐξήνομεν which is so unusual that Murray's reading is to be preferred. The letter before ν is doubtful, but there does not appear to be room for ἐλαύνομεν.

ΗΜΙΧ. δοκεῖ πάνυ.
21 σαφῆ [γ]ὰρ αὔθ' ἕκαστα σημαίνει τάδε.
ΗΜΙΧ. ἰδού, ἰδού·
καὶ τοὐπίσημον αὐτὸ τῶν ὁπλῶν πάλι[ν].
ΗΜΙΧ. ἄθρει μάλα·
25 αὔτ' ἐστὶ τοῦτο μέτρον [ἐ]κμε[μαγ]μ[έ]νον.
ΗΜΙΧ. χ[ώ]ρει δρόμῳ καὶ τα[. . . . . .] . ν ἔχου
[. . .]οπ . [. . . . .] . [. . . . . .]μενος
Col. v ῥοίβδημ' ἐάν τι τῶν [ἔσω πρὸ]ς οὖς [μόλῃ.

ῥοῖβδος

ΗΜΙΧ. οὐκ εἰσακούω πω [τορῶ]ς τοῦ φθ[έγ]ματος,
ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μὴν ἴχ[νη τε] χὡ στίβος τάδε

102 ε̣πισ̣ι̣μωμ^ο̣ν̣^ι̣ in marg. add. pap.[2] **104** ἐκμεμαγμένον scripsi: ἐκμετρούμενον Hunt **105** δρομωι suprascr. pap.[2]: χε̣τ̣[ ] . ι pap. | κα in και corr. pap.[2] **107** ροιβδημ εαν τις ex ροιβδειαντι corr. pap.[2]: ροιβδοι primitus pap. | ἔσω πρὸς...μόλῃ scripsi: βοῶν δι'...λάβῃ Hunt **109** στιβ ex στιλβ corr. pap.

99 **δοκεῖ πάνυ**: 'I'm quite sure of it.' Cf. Plat. *Euthyd.* 305 c πρὸς δὲ τῷ εἶναι καὶ δοκεῖν πάνυ παρὰ πολλοῖς, where it may be doubted if Stallbaum was right in connecting πάνυ with πολλοῖς.

100 'For each actual mark, as we see them (τάδε), is a clear proof.' For **αὔθ' ἕκαστα** see on Eur. *Phoen.* 494. **σημαίνει** is used absolutely as in *Trach.* 345 χὡ λόγος σημαινέτω.

102 The occurrence of αὐτός in 100 and 104 favours the adoption of **αὐτό** rather than αὖ τό. 'Here is the very imprint of their hoofs.' ἐπίσημον, ἐπίσημα are used of the devices stamped on coins. On the other hand, it seems hardly possible that ἐπίσιμον, if that word is to be discerned in the marginal note, could express the rolling gait of oxen. Robert, accepting σήματα in 96, supposes that both lines refer to the mark of ownership which Apollo had branded on the hoofs of his cattle, and that this mark had been disclosed, probably in 52 f.

104 **ἐκμεμαγμένον**: see cr. n. The tense is a serious objection to the reading ἐκμετρούμενον: contrast Eur. fr. 382, 3, where the present expresses customary action (=ὃς ἐκμετρεῖται). Tr.: 'here is a moulding of the very size.'—**μέτρον** implies that the chorus measured the track with their eyes, and observed its correspondence: cf. *Ai.* 5 μετρούμενον | ἴχνη τὰ κείνου νεοχάραχθ' ὅπως κτέ.

106 Perhaps ἀκροώμενος, if 107 followed immediately, as was probably, though not certainly, the case. The lower margin is broken off, so that the end of the column cannot be fixed.

107 See cr. n. Hunt's restoration is open to two objections. (1) **ῥοίβδημα** is unsuitable, as applied to the lowing of cattle. It is true that Monk read ἐν ῥοιβδήσει βουκολιῶν in Eur. *I. A.* 1086 with this meaning, but none of the subsequent critics, except Paley, has agreed with him. ῥοίβδησις there expresses the whistling of the herdsmen, just as ῥοῖζος is attributed to shepherds in Hom. ι 315. Following the clue which these passages suggest, I have provisionally restored as above. (2) The usage of tragedy invariably requires δι' ὤτων (ὠτός) in the proposed context: see Aesch. *Cho.* 54, 449. Soph. *O. T.* 1387, *Ant.* 1188, *El.* 737, 1439, fr. 858. Eur. *Med.* 1139, *Rhes.* 294, 566.—ῥοῖβδος is παρεπιγραφή, and appears to refer to the sound of the lyre which the semi-chorus fails to recognize. Wilamowitz thinks the word could not be so applied: but see on 255. Robert also explains ῥοῖβδος as the bellowing of the cattle, but objects to Hunt's restoration on the ground that, though the παρεπιγραφή follows 107, the sound had already been heard and correctly interpreted by the first speaker.

109 f. The construction is as follows: αὐτά τε ἴχνη καὶ ὁ στίβος [*i.e.* the indi-

κείνων ἐναργῆ τῶν β[ο]ῶν μαθεῖν πάρα. 110

ΗΜΙΧ. ἔα μάλα.
παλινστραφῆ τοι ναὶ μὰ Δία τὰ βήματα
ἐς τοὔμπαλιν δέδορκεν· αὐτὰ δ' εἶσιδε.
τί ἐστὶ τουτί; τίς ὁ τρόπος τοῦ τάγματ[ος;]
ἕ[ς] τοὐπίσω τὰ πρόσθεν ἤλλακται, τὰ δ' αὖ 115
ἐναντί' ἀλλήλοισι συμπ[επλεγ]μένα.
δεινὸς κυκησμὸς εἶχ[ε τὸν βοη]λάτην.

ΣΙ. τίν' αὖ τέχνην σὺ τήν[δ' ἄρ' ἐξ]ηῦρες, τίν' αὖ,

113 *εἰς* pap. et saepius | *αὖ* pap., unde *δέδορκεν αὖ· τὰδ'* Hunt **114** *τουτί*: *α* (*i.e.* *ταυτι*) suprascr. pap.[2] | *πράγματος* in marg. add. pap.[2] **118** *εὗρες* pap.

vidual marks and the entire trail] *κείνων τῶν βοῶν πάρα* [=*πάρεισι*] *τάδε ἐναργῆ μαθεῖν*. Wilamowitz at one time placed a colon after *στίβος*, but subsequently preferred a full stop before *μαθεῖν*. The latter alternative is the better of the two, but there is no reason why the passage should not be continuous.

112 f. **ναὶ μὰ Δία** occurs also in Eur. *Cycl.* 555, 558, 586. We may render: 'nay, verily, the footprints are reversed and face in the opposite direction.' *ναί*, as Shilleto remarked (Dem. *de fals. leg.* p. 285), serves not so much 'the purpose of affirming the preceding position, as of ushering in the subsequent objection.' Cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* 1. 6. 29 *οὐ γιγνώσκεις ὅτι κακοῦργοί τέ εἰσι καὶ... πλεονεξίαι; ναὶ μὰ Δί', ἔφη, θηρίων γε.* In *mem.* 2. 2. 11 *ναὶ μὰ Δία* is a protest against the question, 'why, of course I do.' For the sense cf. *h. Herm.* 344 *τῇσιν μὲν γὰρ βουσὶν ἐς ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα | ἀντία βήματ' ἔχουσα κόμιε ἀνέφαινε μέλαινα.* Hunt puts a full stop after *βήματα*, and adopts the circumflex accent of the papyrus by reading *αὖ· τὰδ'* (see cr. n.). But the arrangement in the text is much better: in English the emphasis would be expressed by 'just *look* at them.' For the emphatic position of *αὐτά* cf. Eur. *Hel.* 421 *αὐτὰ δ' εἰκάσαι | πάρισται ναὸς ἐκβολ' οἷς ἀμπίσχομαι.*

114 **τουτί**. The colloquial form, common in Aristophanes, does not occur elsewhere in the text of the tragedians.—**τάγματος**: a rare word, mostly confined to late prose. But it does not seem right to prefer the more usual and vaguer *πράγματος*.

115 f. 'The front marks have shifted to the back, and some again are interlaced facing in opposite directions to each other.' They reach a point where the general direction of the trail appears to be reversed, so that the forward marks are now turned the wrong way: besides this, many of the hoof-marks are half obliterated by others going in the reverse direction. The language follows *h. Herm.* 77 *ἀντία ποιήσας ὁπλάς, τὰς πρόσθεν ὀπισθεν, | τὰς δ' ὄπιθεν πρόσθεν, κατὰ δ' ἕμπαλιν αὐτὸς ἔβαινε* (Hermes drives the cows backwards, while he himself walks forwards). Cacus carried out the same trick differently: Verg. *Aen.* 8. 210 *cauda in speluncam tractos vestigia retro | egerat.* Hunt supports **συμπεπλεγμένα** by quoting Xen. *Cyn.* 5. 6 *τὰ ἴχνη ὁμοῦ... τοῦ δ' ἥρωος συμπεπλεγμένα*. One might also conjecture *συμπεφυρμένα*. Robert takes an entirely different view of this passage. According to him the cunning of Hermes was much more complicated: (1) Some of the cows were driven backwards [112]; (2) others had their front hoofs *twisted inwards* [115 *ἓς τοὐπίσω... ἤλλακται*]; (3) others again had their back hoofs *twisted outwards* [*ἐναντί' ἀλλήλοισι*]. Since, however, this meaning cannot be extracted from the parallel passage in the hymn, Robert believes that Sophocles was a deliberate innovator. The difficulty arises from a refusal to believe that *ἀντία ποιήσας ὁπλάς* in Homer, and *ἐς τοὐπίσω τὰ πρόσθεν ἤλλακται* in Sophocles, can both be applied simply to the reversal of the direction of the hoofs.

118 f. Hunt, reading *κεκλιμένον*, places the mark of interrogation at the end of 118. This requires **πρόσπαιον** (*sc.* *ἐστί*) to be used in the sense of *θαυμαστόν*, whereas *πρόσπαιος* is rather *new* than *strange*.

πρόσπαιον ὧδε κεκλιμ[ένος] κυνηγετεῖν
πρὸς γῇ ; τίς ὑμῶν ὁ τρόπος ; οὐχὶ μανθάνω. 120
[ἐ]χῖνος ὥς τ[ι]ς ἐν λόχμῃ κεῖσαι πεσών,
[ἤ] τις πίθη[κο]ς κύβδ' ἀποθυμαίνεις τινί.
τ[ί] ταῦτα ; π[οῦ] γῆς ἐμάθετ' ; ἐν π[οί]ῳ τόπῳ ;
[ση]μήνατ', ο[ὐ γ]ὰρ ἴδρις εἰμὶ τοῦ τρόπου.
ΧΟ. ὦ [ὦ] ὦ ὦ. 125
ΣΙ. τ[ί τοῦτ' ἰύζεις ;] τίνα φοβῇ ; τίν' εἰσορᾷς ;
τ[ί δεῖμ' ὄπωπ]ας ; τί ποτε βακχεύεις ἔχων ;
ἀ[λλ' οὐ τίς ἦχε]ι κέρχνος ἱμείρει[ς] μαθεῖν ;
τ[ί δῆτα σιγ]ᾶθ', οἱ πρ[ὸ τοῦ λαλίστ]ατοι ;

119 κεκλιμένον Hunt, interrogatione intra v. 118 terminata **122** κύβδα θυμαίνεις olim Hunt **123** τροπωι pap.: corr. Wilamowitz **128** vid. comm. | ειμειρει[.] pap., primum ε del. pap.^{2} **129** σιγᾶθ' οἱ Theonem legisse testatur pap.^{2}: [σιγ]ᾶτ' ὦ pap.

For the adverb ('so newly bowed to earth') cf. Nic. *Ther.* 689 *εἰ δὲ σύ γε σκύλακας γαλέης ἢ μητέρα λαιδρὴν | ἀγρεύσαις πρόσπαιον.*

121 Just as the proverb *μία λόχμη οὐ τρέφει δύο ἐριθάκους* (Zenob. 5. 11) implies that a bush offers only limited accommodation, so here the satyrs are doubled up as completely as the hedgehog, when he is tucked into a space just large enough for him. The *ἐχῖνος* cunningly conceals himself for purposes of self-defence : cf. Ion Chius fr. 38, 4 *στρόβιλος ἀμφάκανθον* (Salmasius for *ἀμφ' ἄκανθαν*) *εἰλίξας δέμας | κεῖται θιγεῖν τε καὶ δακεῖν ἀμήχανος.*

122 The exact intention of the allusion is obscure. **ἀποθυμαίνεις**, which, if sound, provides the only instance in the text of an irregular anapaest (see p. 230), is an unknown compound, and it is difficult to perceive the relevance of any derivative of *θυμαίνω*. Wilamowitz suggested that *ἀποθυμαίνειν* was used for *ἀποθυμιᾶν*, and that the latter was a synonym of *ἀποπέρδεσθαι*. But the double assumption is unwarrantable. Hunt, in order to secure the same meaning, conjectured *ἀπιθμαίνεις* from Hesych. II pp. 350, 371 *s.vv. ἰθμαίνων* and *ἰσμαίνει*,—evidence which fails to prove that *ἰθμαίνειν* could be used for *πέρδεσθαι*. The associations of **κύβδα** are different, if we may judge by Ar. *Eq.* 365, *Pac.* 897, *Thesm.* 489 (with Blaydes's n.): in other words, it alludes to *σχῆμα ἀκόλαστον καὶ ἑταιρικόν* (schol. Ar. *Lys.* 231). Hence I formerly suggested *ποθομανής* on the analogy of *ἐρωτομανής*, but would now prefer *πόθον ἐνεὶς* (Eur. *Bacch.* 851), as a somewhat easier change and as accounting better for *τινί*.

123 ***τί ταῦτα***; see on Eur. *Hel.* 991, and Gildersleeve, *Synt.* § 132.

125 **ὦ ὦ**, which recurs at 170, is an exclamation of alarm ; not of admiration, as in Ar. *Plut.* 895, where schol. R remarks : *ἐπίρρημα θαυμαστικόν, ὅπερ ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ λέγομεν.*

127 **ἔχων** is colloquial. It is explained by Kuehner-Gerth II 62 (followed by Starkie on Ar. *Nub.* 131) as originally transitive (*i.e.* *ἔχων* governs *τί*). Subsequently it became intransitive, as employed in Ar. *Ran.* 202 *οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις ἔχων*, *ib.* 512 *ληρεῖς ἔχων*. It follows that in the fifth century *ἔχων* was no longer considered to be transitive.

128 f. The supplement of Wilamowitz *ἀγχοῦ τις ἦχει κέρχνος·* was adopted by Hunt in both his editions. In that case, it would seem necessary also to accept *ἱμείρω* from the same critic ; for, as he says, the chorus have not shown any desire to investigate the sound. But we may very well read *ἀλλ' οὐ τίς...ἱμείρεις μαθεῖν ;* as in the text, with *τί δῆτα* (Hunt) in place of *τί ἦν ; τί* in the following line. **ἀλλά** is idiomatic in introducing a fresh question, as explained by Maetzner on Lycurg. 144.—For **κέρχνος** see on fr. 279. —The reading of Theon (*σιγᾶθ' οἱ*) is very much more forcible, as marking the contrast with their former loquacity.

ΧΟ. σ[ίγα μὲν οὖν.]
ΣΙ. τ[ίν' ἔστ' ἐκεῖθε]ν ἀπονοσ[φίζ]εις ἔχων ;
ΧΟ. ἄ[κουε δή.]
Col. vi ΣΙ. καὶ πῶς ἀκούσ[ω μηδεν]ὸς φωνὴν κλύων ;
ΧΟ. ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ.
ΣΙ. ἐμ[ὸν] δίω[γμά γ' οὐδα]μῶς ὀνήσετε.
ΧΟ. ἄκουσον αὖ τ[ο]ῦ χρ[ήμα]τ[ο]ς χρόνον τινά,
[ο]ἵῳ 'κπ[λ]αγέντες ἐν[θάδ'] ἐξενίσμεθα
ψόφῳ τὸν οὐδε[ὶ]ς π[ώπο]τ' ἤκουσεν βροτῶν.
ΣΙ. τί μοι ψ[ό]φον φοβ[εῖσθε] κα[ὶ] δειμαίνετε,
μάλθης ἄναγνα σώ[μα]τ' ἐκμεμαγμένοι,
κάκιστα θηρῶν ὄντ[ες, ἐ]ν [π]άσῃ σκιᾷ
φόβον βλέποντες, πάν[τα] δειματούμενοι,
ἄνευρα κἀκόμιστ[α] κάνε[λε]ύθερα

137 'κπλαγ(έντες) Aristophanem, ἐνθάδ' ἐξενίσμεθα Theonem legisse testatur pap.[2]: π[Λ]αγεντες . . ἐξ[.] . γισμεθα (ἐξωργίσμεθα ?) pap. **139** post ψόφον interpunxit pap. **140** ἐκμεμαγμένα Aristophanem legisse testatur pap.[2]

131 ἀπονοσφίζεις, an ingenious restoration of Wilamowitz, after *O. T.* 480 *τα μεσόμφαλα γὰς ἀπονοσφίζων μαντεία*, where the verb is glossed by *φυγών*.

135 For the palaeographical data see Hunt's note. The received supplements are not convincing, and the retort suggests the repetition of *ἐμοί* (*e.g. ἐμοὶ δ' ἐρευναν*).

136 f. ἄκουσον *κτέ*. 'Listen to the thing for a bit, and hear what a noise ...' The subordinate clause introduced by *οἵῳ* takes the place of the *acc. rei*, which is normally combined with the genitive of the personal object following *ἀκούω* (*audire ex aliquo aliquid*'). Cf. *e.g. Phil.* 1273 *βούλομαι δέ σου κλύειν ποτερα δίδοκται*. For *αὖ τοῦ* Maas conjectured *αὐτός*, but surely the article is required with *χρήματος*. The latter word is used colloquially, just as we say 'the thing,' with a touch of contempt. Cf. 365, and see Neil on *Eq.* 1219, Starkie on *Vesp.* 933. **ἐξενίσμεθα** is more suitable to the context than *ἐξωργίσμεθα*, if that was the original reading of the papyrus; but the meaning required ('to be astounded'), which is common in Polybius, has hitherto been regarded as post-classical. M. Ant. 8. 15 *αἰσχρὸν ἐστι ξενίζεσθαι, εἰ ἡ συνὴ σῦκα φέρει*.

139 ψόφον φοβεῖσθε. For the proverbial *ψοφοδεής* see on fr. 61. The stop which is placed after *ψόφον* in the papyrus must be an error.

140 μάλθης. The substance intended, which is chosen for its compressible character, is described as *κηρὸς μεμαλαγμένος* (Bekk. *anecd.* p. 278, 23: cf. Ael. et Paus. fr. 251 a Schw.). See also Sandys on Dem. 46. 11.—Since it appears to be necessary to admit *ὄντες* in 141, I have retained **ἐκμεμαγμένοι** here (see cr. n.) rather than *ἐκμεμαγμένα*, which is preferred by Hunt.

141 f. κάκιστα is difficult, unless *ὄντα κἀν* is read, as I formerly proposed. Hunt states, however, that there is not room for this reading in the lacuna. Contrast 147 *κάκιστα θηρίων*, and for the grammatical principle see Kuehner-Gerth § 363. We can hardly carry on *σώματα*, and must suppose that *κάκιστα* is nominalized like *τὰ πρῶτα* in Ar. *Ran.* 421. There is a formal parallel in Thuc. 4. 76 *ἔστι δὲ ἡ Χαιρώνεια ἔσχατον τῆς Βοιωτίας*. I do not add 1. 138 *ἐδόκει γὰρ πολυωνότατον τῶν τότε εἶναι* (*sc.* ἡ Λάμψακος), for there *τῶν τότε* may be neuter. *Θηρί'* conj. Wecklein.—For the sense cf. Shaksp. *M. N. D.* v. 1. 21 *Or, in the night, imagining some fear, | how easy is a bush supposed a bear!*

143 ἄνευρα feeble. Cf. Theopomp. fr. 71 (1 752 K.) *ἄνευοι, ἀνευρος, ἀσθενής, ἀνέντατος*.—**ἀκόμιστα**: slovenly.

διακονοῦντες, [σ]ώ[μ]ατ' εἰ[σ]ιδ[ε]ῖν μόνον
κα[ὶ γ]λῶσσα κα[ὶ] φ[αλ]ῆτες,—εἰ δέ που δέῃ, 145
πιστοὶ λόγοισιν ὄντες ἔργα φεύγετε—
τοιοῦ[δ]ε πατρός, ὦ κάκιστα θηρίων,
οὗ πόλλ' ἐφ' ἥβης μνήματ' ἀνδρείας ὕπο
κ[ε]ῖται παρ' οἴκοις νυμφικοῖς ἠσκημένα,
οὐκ ἐς φυγὴν κλίνοντος, οὐ δειλ[ο]υμένου, 150
οὐδὲ ψόφοισι τῶν ὀρειτρόφων βοτῶν
[π]τήσσοντος, ἀλλ' α[ἰχ]μαῖσιν ἐξει[ρ]γασμένου

144 *σχήματ'* malim **150** *δειλουμένου* in marg. Ni(candro) adscriptum: *δουλουμένου* pap. **152** *αἰχμαῖσιν* scripsi: *ἀκμαῖσιν* Hunt | *ἐξειργασμένον* ex *ἐξειργασμένα* corr. pap.^{2}

144 σώματα does not seem to be used alone in the contemptuous sense of *hulks* or *carcases*. If, therefore, the conditions permitted, I should have preferred to substitute *σχήματ'*,—mere shapes without substance. Cf. Eur. fr. 25 *γέροντες οὐδέν ἐσμεν ἄλλο πλὴν ψόφος καὶ σχῆμ'*. id. fr. 360, 27 *μὴ σχήματ' ἄλλως ἐν πόλει πεφυκότα*. I am glad to find that Robert also is dissatisfied with *σώματ'*, but his conjecture *ὄμματ'* is no improvement.

145 φαλῆτες. Satyric choruses wore the phallus: cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 439, and see Haigh, *Attic Theatre*^{3}, p. 294. For the comic stage see schol. Ar. *Nub.* 538.—**εἰ..δέῃ**, at a pinch. For the subjunctive with *εἰ* cf. *O. C.* 1443, *Ant.* 710, Ar. *Eq.* 698. It is not easy to recover the *nuance* of the construction, or to understand why it was occasionally preferred to the normal uses. Neil (on *Eq.* l.c.) seems to think that it was paratragoedic in Aristophanes, but it may rather have been the literary survival of an almost extinct colloquialism, like our *an't please you*. For other examples see Kuehner-Gerth II 474.

147 τοιοῦδε πατρός is isolated. In order to show that it is a continuation of the address from *φαλῆτες*, I have printed *εἰ...φεύγετε* as a parenthesis.

148 The exploits of Silenus, his wanderings with Dionysus, and his share in the battle with the giants, are recorded in Eur. *Cycl.* 2—9. Wilamowitz (p. 455) thinks that the present passage refers rather to hunting adventures (Jagdabenteuer): see on 152.

149 οἴκοις νυμφικοῖς: *i.e.* in the caves of the nymphs. Cf. Hom. *h. Aphr.* 262 *τῇσι δὲ Σιληνοί τε καὶ εὐσκοπος Ἀργειφόντης | μίσγονθ' ἐν φιλότητι μυχῷ σπείων ἐροέντων*.

150 ἐς φυγὴν κλίνοντος, giving way to flight. For the use of *κλίνω* cf. Polyb. I. 27. 8 *τῶν περὶ τὰ μέσα Καρχηδονίων ἐκ παραγγέλματος κλινάντων πρὸς φυγήν*. Aristid. I p. 178 *ἐπεὶ δ' ἔκλινε τὰ πράγματα*. In Eur. *Suppl.* 704 *ἔκλινε γὰρ κέρας | τὸ λαιὸν ἡμῶν* the verb might be intransitive, although the editors are probably right in making *κέρας* the object.—**δειλουμένου** (see cr. n.) is rather more pointed than *δουλουμένου*, which requires to be defined (*e.g.* by *τῇ γνώμῃ*). Wilamowitz compares *ἀγριοῦσθαι, γαυριοῦσθαι*, etc.

152 αἰχμαῖσιν. The plural indicates different occasions, and by the use of the word the speaker does not so much refer to a definite weapon as to martial achievements in general. Thus the meaning is equivalent to *vi et armis*, or practically to 'in battle.' Cf. Eur. fr. 16 *λαμπροὶ δ' ἐν αἰχμαῖς Ἄρεος ἔν τε συλλόγοις. Phoen.* 1273 *αἰχμὴν ἐς μίαν καθέστατον*. Soph. *Phil.* 1307 *κακοὺς | ὄντας πρὸς αἰχμήν*. See also Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 158.—Hunt gives *ἀκμαῖσιν* with a colon after **ἐξειργασμένου**, though I do not understand how his reading admits of the translation 'but did deeds of strength.' But it is surely far more natural to suppose that the object of *ἐξειργασμένου* is the antecedent to *ἅ* (*i.e.* deeds which) in 153, than that the relative looks back to *μνήματα* in 148. Nevertheless, Wilamowitz also takes *μνήματα* to be the immediate antecedent of *ἅ*. Both he and Robert infer from the text that Silenus is boasting not of his martial exploits, but of his prowess as a hunter, *i.e.* (I suppose) the

[ἃ] νῦν ὑφ' ὑμῶν λάμ[πρ' ἀ]πορρυπαίνεται
[ψ]όφῳ νεώρει κόλακ[ι] ποιμένων π[ο]θέν;
[τί] δὴ φοβεῖσθε παῖδες ὡς πρὶν εἰσιδεῖν,
πλοῦτον δὲ χ[ρ]υσόφαντον ἐξαφί[ε]τε
ὃν Φοῖβος ὑμῖν εἶπε κ[ἀ]νεδέξατο,
καὶ τὴν ἐλευθέρωσιν ἣν κατῄνεσεν
Col. vii ὑμῖν τε κἀμοί; ταῦτ' ἀφέντες εὕδετε.
εἰ μὴ 'νανοστήσαντες ἐξιχνεύσε[τε
τὰς βοῦς ὅπῃ βεβᾶσι καὶ τὸν βουκόλο[ν,

153 ὑμῶν ex ἡμῶν corr. pap.[2] | ὑπορρυπαίνεται praetulit Hunt | post hunc v. lacunam indicat Wilamowitz **155** τί supplevi: ὃν Wilamowitz **159** ἀφέντες ex αφαντες corr. pap.[2]

object of ἐξειργασμένου 'having destroyed' is βοτά. The removal of the colon makes this assumption unnecessary, and in my opinion clears up the whole passage. It follows, of course, that I cannot assent to Robert's conception of the character of Silenus as standing on a much loftier plane of morality than the mean-spirited sot in the *Cyclops*. See also on 199 ff.

153 f. ἀπορρυπαίνεται is more emphatic and therefore better than ὑπορρυπαίνεται (cr. n.). Wilamowitz holds that there is a lacuna after this line, on the ground that the dative ψόφῳ is otherwise intolerably harsh, unless supported by a participle like ἐκπλαγέντων. But this is unduly to limit the sphere of the causal (instrumental) dative, which is not infrequently applied to the influence of external circumstances in the place of διά c. acc. See *El.* 549, *Trach.* 1127, *Ant.* 691 with Jebb's nn. Eur. *Hel.* 79 n., *Helid.* 474 n. *Andr.* 157 στυγοῦμαι δ' ἀνδρὶ φαρμάκοισι σοῖς. *ib.* 247 μισοῦν γε πατρίδα σὴν Ἀχιλλέως φόνῳ. *El.* 149 χέρα δὲ κρᾶτ' ἐπὶ κούριμον | τιθεμένα θανάτῳ σῷ. I dwell upon this the more, because the examples given by Kuehner-Gerth I 439 are not representative of this aspect of the idiom. **κόλακι** is obscure, and, if Hunt is right in rendering it 'cheating,' one does not see whom shepherds are supposed to delude. I suggest that there is a contemptuous allusion to the soothing of the shepherd's pipe: Eur. fr. 773, 27 σύριγγας δ' οὐριβάται κινοῦσιν ποίμνας, ἐλάται. *Al.* 577 βοσκήμασι σοῖσι συρίζων | ποιμνίτας ὑμεναίους. *Rhes.* 551 ἤδη δὲ νέμουσι κατ' Ἴδαν | ποίμνια· νυκτιβρόμου σύριγγος ἰὰν κατακούω. Soph. *Phil.* 213 οὐ μολπὰν σύριγγος ἔχων, ὡς ποιμὰν ἀγροβότας. Eur. *Hel.* 1483 σύριγγι πειθόμεναι ποιμένος,—transferred to the cranes. What else than the strains of the pipe can be the 'shepherds' noise'? The shepherd pipes to his flock which obeys him: *i.e.* the sound is intended to *soothe* the flock. Observe how this description of the sound confirms the interpretation given of 107. Hunt places a comma at the end of 154, and accepts ὃν from Wilamowitz in 155; but the multiplication of relative clauses is rather to be avoided.

155 The child's fear of the unknown may be illustrated from Plat. *Phaed.* 77 E ἴσως ἔνι τις καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν παῖς ὃς τὰ τοιαῦτα φοβεῖται. To be afraid before you have cause is like crying out before you are hurt (*Phil.* 917, Ar. *Plut.* 477).

156 χρυσόφαντον is a new compound. Cf. 45.

157 ἀνεδέξατο is a formal word for *to undertake, acknowledge, become responsible for*. Cf. Isae. 3. 18. Dem. 33. 22, 35. 7, 46. 7, 59. 58.

159 εὕδετε: *ye are idle*. The application to persons in the metaphorical sense is Sophoclean: *O.T.* 65 ὥστ' οὐχ ὕπνῳ γ' εὕδοντά μ' ἐξεγείρετε. *O. C.* 307 κεἰ βραδὺς | εὕδει.

160 ἀνανοστήσαντες, not *to pursue* (Hunt) but *to return to the path*. It should be remembered that the simple verb does not primarily or chiefly mean *to return*.—For the minatory condition see Goodwin, § 447.

κλαίοντες αὐτῇ δειλίᾳ ψοφή[σ]ετε.
ΧΟ. πάτερ, παρὼν αὐτός με συμποδηγέτε[ι,
ἵν' εὖ κατειδῇς εἴ τίς ἐστι δειλία.
γνώσῃ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἂν παρῇς οὐδὲν λέγω[ν. 165
ΣΙ. ἐγὼ πα[ρ]ὼν αὐτός σε προσβιβῶ λόγῳ
κυνορτικὸν σύριγμα διακαλούμεν[ος].
ἀλλ' εἶ' [ἀ]φίστω τριζύγης οἴμου βάσιν,

165 λόγων, ut videtur, pap.^{2} **168** ιει in εἶ' corr. pap. | ἀφίστω scripsi: ἐφίστω Hunt | οἴμου pap.

162 Hunt's rendering 'you shall make a noise in lamentation for your very cowardice' is not quite clear. Rather: 'your very cowardice shall end in noisy whimpering.' **αὐτῇ**: *i.e.* so far from escaping from pain by your cowardice, it will be the cause of your chastisement. Wecklein's *αὐτοί* is unnecessary. I suppose **ψοφήσετε** to have been deliberately chosen instead of *βοήσεσθε* in reference to the disturbing *ψόφος* of 154, just as conversely *βοᾶν* is sometimes ironically applied to inanimate objects (*e.g.* Ar. *Ran.* 859). It is difficult to say whether the dative is rather causal or circumstantial, but the character of the noun distinguishes this example from the familiar type of fr. 958. Maas, however, thinks that *ψοφήσετε* is a vulgarism for *ἀπολεῖσθε*, on the ground that it is used with that sense in Byzantine and modern Greek. Wilamowitz calls attention to the similar development of *διαφωνεῖν* (Agatharchides ap. Phot. *bibl.* 457, 25).

163 **συμποδηγέτει**: this is a new word beside *συμποδηγεῖν*, corresponding to *ποδηγετεῖν* : *ποδηγεῖν*. Cf. *κυνηγετεῖν* : *κυνηγεῖν*.

165 **αὐτός** appears to belong to *παρῇς*, as well as to *παρών* in 163 and 166. In each case it bears a considerable emphasis: 'Father, *do* come *yourself*...' and so forth.

166 **προσβιβῶ λόγῳ**, not 'I will urge you on by my voice' (Hunt) but 'I will win you over by argument.' The phrase is used ironically of a *persuasion* that will not derive its force from logical superiority. Cf. Ar. *Av.* 425 *προσβιβᾷ λέγων*. *Eq.* 35 *εὖ προσβιβάζεις μ'*. Aeschin. 3. 93 *τῷ λόγῳ προσβιβάζων ὑμᾶς.. ὡς κτέ.*

167 **κυνορτικὸν σύριγμα** may be illustrated from the note on fr. 9 *ἐπισίγματα*. —**διακαλούμενος**: the encouragement will be given in various (δια-) quarters.

168 *ἐφίστω* was adopted by Hunt and Wilamowitz, and compared with *Trach.* 339 *τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν*, which would then be interpreted 'why dost thou approach me thus?' The present passage is rendered 'take your stand at the cross-ways'; and, since the relevance of the remark to the situation is not apparent, Wilamowitz constructs an elaborate *mise en scène* in justification of the text. Three paths are represented on the stage, converging at the cave of Cyllene, and possibly rising towards it. The chorus in the orchestra divide themselves into three bodies, each of which follows one of the paths indicated. He points out that the wooden stage-buildings provided for each performance allowed considerable freedom to the poet for the arrangement of his stage. In conformity with the supposed conditions, he divides the chorus into three rather than two sections in the passage beginning at v. 94. This is ingenious rather than convincing, and **τριζύγης οἴμου** is too slender a foundation to support the superstructure. I have proposed to restore **ἀφίστω**, which yields a simple and appropriate meaning. To stand at the cross-roads, *i.e.* at a point where the road bifurcates (as explained by Gildersleeve on Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 38 *κατ' ἀμευσιπόρους τριόδους ἐδινήθην*, | *ὁρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρίν*), was a proverbial image typical of hesitation: Theogn. 911 *ἐν τριόδῳ δ' ἕστηκα· δύ' εἰσὶ τὸ πρόσθεν ὁδοί μοι·* | *φροντίζω τούτων ἥντιν' ἴω προτέρην*. Oppian *Halieut.* 3. 501 *εἰκελος ἀνδρὶ* | *ξείνῳ, ὃς ἐν τριόδοισι πολυτρίπτοισι κυρήσας* | *ἕστη ἐφορμαίνων κραδίῃ τε οἱ ἄλλοτε λαιὴν,* | *ἄλλοτε δεξιτερὴν ἐπιβάλλεται ἀτραπὸν ἐλθεῖν·* | *παπταίνει δ' ἑκάτερθε, νόος δέ οἱ ἠύτε κῦμα* | *εἰλεῖται, μάλα δ' ὀψὲ μιῆς ὠρέξατο βουλῆς*. Hesych. 11 p. 110. Zenob. 3. 78. Suid. *s.v. ἐν τριόδῳ εἰμὶ λογισμῶν. παροιμία. ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδήλων καὶ*

ἐγὼ δ' ἐν [ἔ]ργοις παρμένων σ' ἀπευθυνῶ.
ΧΟ. ὒ ὒ ὒ, ψ ψ, ἆ ἆ. λέγ' ὅ τι πονεῖς. 170
τί μάτην ὑπέκλαγες ὑπέκριγες
ὑπό μ' ἰδες; ἔχεται
ἐν πρώτῳ τίς ὅδε τρόπ[ῳ;
ἔχει· ἐλήλυθεν, ἐλήλ[υθεν·
ἐμὸς εἶ, ἀνάγου. 175
δεῦτ', ὦ, τίς ὅδε . [. . . .] . της
ὁ δράκις, ὁ γράπις [. . . . .]

172 *ὑπό μ' ἰδες* ex *ὑπ' ἐμὲ ἰδες* corr. pap.[2] **173** *ἐν* ex *ἑ* corr. pap.[2] **174** *ἐλελυθεν* (bis) pap.: corr. pap.[2] **176** *δεῦτε ὦ* in marg. pap.[2]: *δευτερῳ* pap.

ἀμφιβόλων πραγμάτων. It is evident, then, that 'to leave the cross-road' is the same as 'to go straight on,' or, in other words, 'to hesitate no longer'; and it will be observed how well that agrees with the appearance of *ἀπευθυνῶ* in the following line. Here of course we have nothing but a figure of speech directed against the trembling satyrs: there was no cross-road on the stage.—It may be assumed that **ἀφίστω** is intransitive in accordance with its usage, and that **βάσιν** is parallel to *Ai.* 42 *τήνδ' ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν*, and less closely to Eur. *Hel.* 802 *ἐκβὰς πόδα* (n.).—For the compound adjective with three terminations see on fr. 394.—For the aspiration of *οἶμον* Wilamowitz quotes Herodian 1 546 Lentz *τὸ οἶμος, οἰμῶ δασύνεται*: cf. *φροίμιον*.

170 ff. The chorus bustle to and fro in a series of spasmodic attempts to follow up the trail. Apparently they fall foul of each other in their clumsy and blundering movements; and there was an opportunity for a certain amount of pantomimic-buffoonery. The ode should no doubt be divided between different speakers, but is too much mutilated to justify an attempt to distribute the constituent elements. There is a high degree of probability in Robert's view (p. 547) that the lyrics are a Common between Silenus and the chorus, and that the greater part of them came from the lips of Silenus. Thus the various commands and appeals agree with his promise in 166 f., and the question of the chorus in 197 is unnatural, if supposed to refer so far back as 30 lines.—The metre comprises resolved anapaests (proceleusmatics: Ar. *Ai.* 327. *Lys.* 480, Pratinas fr. 1) combined with cretics. 173 is probably a glyconic. **ὒ ὒ ὒ**: see on 125. **ψ** without a vowel sound recalls the Plautine *st*. It is not recorded elsewhere, but is apparently a drover's cry like *ψό* fr. 521. Wilamowitz rejects the arrangement *ὑπό μ' ψαῖ*, forms which are equally devoid of authority.

171 f. 'Why dost idly groan and gibber and look askance at me?' *ὑποκρίζω* is used by Aelian *nat. an.* 6. 19 of the noise made by the locust. *κρίζω*, *to squeak* or *creak*, is used also of the sound of foreign speech (Ar. *Av.* 1520) and of the chirping of a bird (Hom. B 314). *ὑποκλάζω* does not occur elsewhere.

173 ἐν πρώτῳ...τρόπῳ: does this mean 'in the first lap (turn)'? So *τρόπος* = 'direction' in Herod., *e.g.* 1. 189 *διώρυχας ὀγδώκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν...τετραμμένας πάντα τρόπον*. Robert however reads *τρόποι*, referring to 120.

174 ἔχει: you are caught.

175 ἀνάγου: 'off with you!' *i.e.* consider yourself a prisoner. *ἀνάγειν*, technically *to arrest*, is illustrated by Holden on Plut. *Them.* 23.

176 Robert restores *δευτέρῳ τίς ὅδε τρόπος; ἔτης κτέ*., and is probably right in supposing that at this point Silenus addresses individual satyrs by name: *ἔτης ὁ Δράκις, ὁ Γράπις, Θόρλαξ, Μέθυσος* (or *Μεθύων*), *Στράτιος, Κροσίας* (cf. *κνησίας*), and lastly *Τράχις*, which is to be compared with *Δράκις* on the Brygos vase and *Ἠδύλις* (Heydemann, *Satyr- u. Bakchennamen*, pp. 36, 38).

177 δράκις is an unknown word, but its correctness is rendered probable by the presence of *γράπις*. Wilamowitz adduces *Δράκις*, which is the name of a satyr on more than one inscription (Pauly-Wissowa v 1568). For *γράπις*

[ο]ὐρίας οὐρίας αδ[. . . . .]κεις
παρέβης· μεθυ[. . . . .]
ὅτι ποτε φερε[. . . . .] . ι[.]ν 180
ἔποχον ἔχει τι[. . . . .]
στίβος ὁδενεσ[. . . . .]
στράτιος στράτ[ιος . . . . .]υ[. .]
δεῦρ᾽ ἔπου· τ[.] δρ[. . . . .]
Col. viii ἔνι β[ο]ῦς ἔνι πόνο[185
μὴ μεθῇ κρ[ο]κία[ς
σὺ τί καλ[ὸ]ν ἐπιδ[
ὅδε γ᾽ ἀγαθὸς ὁ τρέ[χις
κατὰ νόμον ἔπεται[ι
ἐφέπου ἐφέπου μ[190
ὀπποποῖ· ἆ μιαρέ, γε[
ἦ τάχ᾽ ὁπόταν ἀπίῃ[ς
ἀπελεύθερος ὢν ὀλ . [
ἀλλὰ μὴ παραπλακ[
ἔπ[ι]θ᾽ [ἕ]πεχ᾽ εἴσιθ᾽ ἴθι [195
τ[ὸ] δὲ πλάγιον ἔχομ[εν
π[ά]τερ, τί σ[ι]γᾷς; μῶν ἀληθ[ὲς εἴπομεν;
οὐ[κ ε]ἰσακο[ύε]ις, ἢ κεκώ[φησαι, ψόφον;
ΣΙ. σί[γα.

180 *νόμος νόμον* Theonem legisse testatur pap.[2] **186** *με* ex *δε* corr. pap.[2] **192** *ἦ*: *η* supra *ει* scr. pap.[2] **193** *ολβ* legi posse negat Hunt **197** *β* in marg. ducentesimo versui adscriptum

see Hesych. I p. 445 *γράπιν· γῆρας τέττιγος, ἢ ὄφεως, καὶ τῶν ἐκδυομένων. καὶ εἶδος ὀρνέου. καὶ ῥυσσόν, ἀπὸ τοῦ γραμμὰς ἔχειν τὰς ῥυτίδας, ὅθεν καὶ ἡ γραῦς ἠτυμολόγηται.* Here one suspects the meaning *wrinkled*, which is attested also by *Etym. M.* p. 239, 31 *γράπις· ὁ ἐρρυτιδωμένος*. Similar are Aristoph.'s *στρόφις* (*Nub.* 450), *γάστρις* (*Av.* 1604).

179 *μεθύεις, ἀπορεῖς*, Rossbach. But see on 176.

182 *στίβος ὅδε νέος*, Rossbach.

192 The meaning is perhaps again discernible: 'I expect you will soon regain your freedom...,' spoken with irony. However, *ἦ τάχα* is not ironical in Hom. *σ* 73, 338, 399, but expresses a solemn warning or foreboding.

194 We should expect *παραπλαγχθῇς* or *παράπλαγκτος ἴσθι* (*γένῃ*) rather than *παράπλακτος*. But *πλαγκτός* itself is sometimes written *πλακτός* in our MSS: see Aesch. *Pers.* 280, *Ag.* 598.

197 *μῶν* is used ironically: 'can it be that we spoke the truth after all?' For examples see Kuehner-Gerth II 525.

198 *ψόφον* was restored by Wilamowitz. The hyperbaton is not uncommon in tragedy: cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 121 *σπείρουσι δ᾽, ἢ τῷ ζῶσι, Δήμητρος στάχυν; Rhes.* 565 *Διόμηδες, οὐκ ἤκουσας, ἢ κενὸς ψόφος | στάζει δι᾽ ὤτων, τευχέων τινὰ κτύπον; Hel.* 719 n. *Hclid.* 132 n. Soph. fr. 764. Kaibel on *El.* 1358.

199 ff. The proper arrangement of these lines has been the subject of some discussion. The speeches are divided by paragraphi in the papyrus, exactly as they are printed in the text, except that

ΧΟ. τί ἔστιν;
ΣΙ. οὐ μενῶ.
ΧΟ. μέν', εἰ θέλεις.
ΣΙ. οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς σὺ ταῦθ' [ὅπῃ θέλεις

199 τί ἔστιν; etiam Sileno, οὐ μενῶ choro, μέν' εἰ δύνᾳ (quod ex v. 200 eiecto θέλεις huc transtulit Wilamowitz) Sileno tribuit Hunt **200** sqq. choro tribuit Hunt | ὅπῃ δύνᾳ scriptum fuisse, sed βέλτιον esse ὅπῃ θέλεις in marg. testatur pap.[2]

a paragraphus appears after 210, which is unnecessary and unusual if the speech which follows is to be attributed to the coryphaeus. Hunt, however, considering it obvious that 200—203 belong to the chorus, and 204—206 to Silenus, corrects the division of 199 by combining τί ἔστιν with σίγα as a remark of Silenus, and continuing accordingly. Being also of opinion that μέν', εἰ θέλεις is unsuitable as addressed by Silenus to the chorus, and that the repetition of θέλεις is awkward if ὅπῃ θέλεις is adopted in 200—though the latter contention can hardly be admitted—he accepts Wilamowitz's proposal to transfer δύνᾳ from 200 to 199, and attributes μέν' εἰ δύνᾳ to Silenus. By giving 211—214 to Silenus, he allows to the paragraphus after 210 its usual significance. If that view is correct, the upshot of the dialogue will be that the chorus are again alarmed by hearing the sound, and propose to withdraw from the search altogether in favour of their father, but that, after three lines spoken by Silenus, they forthwith resume their labours. I cannot help thinking that, if such was the purpose of Sophocles, his dramatic instinct was temporarily in abeyance. As against Wilamowitz, however, Hunt attributes 252 ff. as well as the subsequent dialogue with Cyllene to the chorus and not to Silenus; and he is consequently driven to suppose that Silenus runs off in alarm directly Cyllene appears. See further in this connexion on 357.

It appears to me, however, not only that the MS arrangement of 199 is susceptible of defence, but that by distributing the following speeches in accordance with its requirements we obtain a comic effect which is exactly in keeping with the character of Silenus, and avoid the necessity of accounting for his subsequent disappearance. The difficulty of the paragraphus after 210 I cannot regard as serious. We do not know enough to feel sure that it might not have been intended to divide the lyrics from the senarii; and in any case errors in its employment are frequent (cf. 68). We suppose, then, that Silenus hears the noise clearly for the first time at v. 198, and is so terrified that he resolves to depart at once and does so, although the chorus apparently attempt to keep him. On that assumption, the ironical tone of **μέν' εἰ θέλεις**, 'do *please* stay,' or '*won't* you stay?' is exactly suitable to the occasion, if the chorus are now aware that Silenus is rather more frightened than the rest of them. Cf. *Phil.* 730 ἔρπ', εἰ θέλεις ('I pray thee, come on'), and *El.* 585 εἰ γὰρ θέλεις, δίδαξον (where the tone is ironical, as here: see Jebb's n.). In 200, so far as the sense is concerned, it is indifferent whether we read ὅπῃ θέλεις or ὅπῃ δύνᾳ (see cr. n.), but the former is to be preferred for the reason that δύνασθαι is a very common gloss on θέλειν in conditions similar to the present. See schol. M Aesch. *Pers.* 177 θέλῃ· ἀντὶ τοῦ δύνηται. Schol. Ar. *Av.* 581 οὐκ ἐθελήσει· ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐ δυνήσεται. Schol. A Hom. Φ 366 ἔθελε] ἠδύνατο. Schol. Hom. A 353, γ 121. Apollon. *lex. Hom.* p. 86, 13. Greg. Cor. p. 135 Sch. Hesych. II pp. 21, 305. Suid. *s.vv.* ἐθελήσει, θέλειν, οὐ θελήσει. Phot. *lex.* p. 82, 17. The grotesque cowardice of Silenus after his vapourings in 147 ff. may be illustrated by his similar behaviour in the *Cyclops* (228 ff.), as well as by the general description of the satyrs in Nonnus (14. 121): ἐν δὲ κυδοιμοῖς | πάντες ἀπειλητῆρες ἀεὶ φεύγοντες Ἐνυώ, | νόσφι μόθοιο λέοντες ἐνὶ πτολέμοις δὲ λαγωοί. I have accordingly proposed to complete 202 f. by reading ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ | μὴ πλεῖστον ἔτι μένοντα διατρίβειν χρόνον, which is consistent with the indications of the papyrus. Robert's view of the character of Silenus as 'himmelweit verschieden' from the portrait given by Euripides has already been mentioned in the n. on 152. He goes so far as to claim that the speech beginning at 139 is worthy of Ajax or any other tragic hero.

ζήτει τε κἀξίχνευε καὶ πλού[τει λαβὼν
τὰς βοῦς τε κα[ὶ] τὸν χρυσὸν [. . . . .]ϵ[.]
μὴ πλεῖστ[. .] . τι . [. .]ν[. . . . .] χρόνον.
ΧΟ. ἀλλ' οὔ τι μ[. . . .] μ[. . . . .]
οὐδ' ἐξυπελ[θεῖ]ν τ[. . . . .]φῶς
εἰδῶμεν ὅν[. . .] . [. . . . .]
ἰὼ γ . [. . . . .]
φθέγμ' ἀφύσ[ϵ]ις[. . . . .]ου
[.]ηδ[. . . . . μισ-]
Col. ix θὸ[ν δ]όμοισιν ὀλβίσῃς.
ὅ[δ' ο]ὗ φαν[εῖτ]αι τοῖσιν· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τάχα
φ[έρ]ων κτύ[π]ον πέδορτον ἐξαναγκάσω
π[η]δήμασιν κραιπνοῖσι καὶ λακτίσμασιν
ὥ[σ]τ' εἰσακοῦσαι κεἰ λίαν κωφός τις εἶ.

204 sqq. Sileno tribuit Hunt **208** *φθεγγμα αφυσ[ϵ]ις* in marg. add. pap.^{2}
211 ὁ δ' Hunt qui hunc et sequentes versus Sileno tribuit **214** *εἶ* pap.: *ᾖ* Hunt

204 is restored by Hunt ἀλλ' *οὔ τι μή σοί μ' ἐκλιπεῖν ἐφήσομαι.* For **οὔ τι μή** cf. *O.C.* 450 ἀλλ' *οὔ τι μὴ λάχωσι τοῦδε συμμάχου.*

205 **ἐξυπελθεῖν** is a hitherto unknown compound, but see on fr. 524. The following words are restored thus by Hunt (partly after Murray): *τοῦ πόνου πρὶν γ' ἂν σαφῶς | εἰδῶμεν ὄντιν' ἔνδον ἥδ' ἔχει στέγη.*

208 ff. **φθέγμ' ἀφύσεις** is restored by Hunt from the margin, since the text is mutilated. He gives reasons against accepting *ἃ φυσᾷς* (Wilamowitz) and suggests that *ἀφύξεις* may have been the reading in the text. No parallel is quoted for the phrase *φθέγμ' ἀφύσσειν*, but it may be illustrated by *γλῶσσαν ἐκχέας* in fr. 929 (n.): the papyrus gives *φθέγγμα* here, as well as in 254, 278, 292, and 320, and that form was approved by Herodian (Crönert, *Mem. Gr. Hercul.* p. 69).—**μισθὸν ὀλβίσῃς**, if joined as 'produce rich pay,' would be parallel to *τυφλοῦν ἔλκος* (*Ant.* 973) and the rest.

211 **ὅδ'...ἀλλ'**: 'he won't show himself for that: well, then....' Hunt, who prefers ὁ δ', makes Silenus the speaker, and treats *τοῖσιν* as masculine. But, in holding that *τοῖσιν* cannot be instrumental (causal), he undoubtedly goes too far: see the passages quoted on 154 and esp. Antiph. 5. 3 *ἄπιστοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ἀληθέσιν αὐτοῖς τούτοις ἀπώλοντο.*

212 **φέρων**, bringing into play, applying to the case. Cf. Eur. *Tro.* 333 *ἔλισσε τᾷδ' ἐκεῖσε μετ' ἐμέθεν ποδῶν | φέρουσα φιλτάταν βάσιν.*—**πέδορτον** is a new word, but appears to be a suitable epithet for the sound produced by feet striking against the ground. Robert however prefers Leo's *φωρῶν* (for *φέρων*): *i.e.* tracking out the sound rising from the ground. But it is surely unnatural to dissociate *κτύπον* from *εἰσακοῦσαι.*

213 **πηδήμασιν.** Cf. Vergil's *saltantes Satyros* (*Ecl.* 5. 73). Cornut. 30. p. 59 *οἱ Σκιρτοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σκαίρειν.* Robert seems to be right in rejecting Leo's view, based on Ter. *Eun.* 285 and other passages, that **λακτίσμασιν** refers to kicks delivered against the door.

214 **ὥστ'** is actually redundant after *ἐξαναγκάσω*, but is often so employed in order to emphasize the result (Eur. *Hel.* 1040 n., Jebb on Soph. *O.C.* 270).—Hunt substitutes *ᾖ* for *εἶ* on the ground that the third person is required. But it would not be unnatural that after *τοῖσιν* in 211 the speaker should turn to address directly the unseen occupant of the cave. For similarly abrupt transitions cf. *O.T.* 1198, Bacchyl. 9. 13. Robert also questions the necessity for Hunt's alteration, but thinks that the text is a conflation of two readings, one of which was *ὥστ' εἰσακούσῃ..εἶ.*

ΚΥΛΛΗΝΗ

θῆρες, τί [τό]νδε χλοερὸν ὑλώδη πάγον
ἔν[θ]ηρον ὡρμήθητε σὺν πολλῇ βοῇ;
τίς ἥδε τέχνη, τίς μετάστασις πόνων
οὓς πρόσθεν εἶχες δεσπότῃ χάριν φέρων,

215 χωρον legisse Aristophanem testatur pap.[2] **217** μετάστασις ex μετασις corr. pap.[2] **218** εἶχες Wilamowitz: ειπες pap.

215 For the description of the scenery see Introductory Note.—Hunt's suggestion that the reading of Aristophanes (cr. n.) was not χῶρον but χλωρόν is almost certainly correct.

216 **σὺν..βοῇ.** For the preposition cf. *El.* 641 μὴ σὺν φθόνῳ τε καὶ πολυγλώσσῳ βοῇ (which also illustrates the double application of σύν in 222), *ib.* 1283.

217 **μετάστασις πόνων**, change from labours: see on fr. 374. For πόνων applied to the rites of Dionysus Robert (p. 552) well quotes Eur. *Bacch.* 66 πόνον ἡδὺν κάματον τ' εὐκάματον, but his further contention that πόνος was a technical expression for the song and dance of the tragic chorus is not established by the evidence which he cites.

218 ff. This is the most puzzling passage in the text so far as it has been recovered, chiefly owing to the difficulty of identifying the master whose proceedings are here described. The general question has been discussed in the Introductory Note, but certain points of detail which arise here still require notice. (1) Hunt suggested (p. 79) that Silenus might be the δεσπότης; and, partly no doubt for this reason, was induced to accept παίδων from Wilamowitz in 222. Apart from other difficulties, a conclusive objection is that Silenus himself, as well as his children, was in servitude to some master (57, 69). (2) The theory of Wilamowitz, who holds that the master's identity was revealed in the latter part of the play, has been already discussed. It should be added that Wilamowitz does not explain how his emendation of 222 can be reconciled with his refusal to put forward any conjecture on the main question. (3) Robert thinks that the service of Dionysus is meant. This is no doubt the first idea that suggests itself; but it cannot be made to harmonize with the text as it stands, and Robert is forced to conclude that a line has been lost after 220, containing the verb required for Dionysus (*e.g.* ἡγεῖτο) and the subject of εὐιάζετο (*i.e.* Silenus). (4) It has already been suggested that the δεσπότης must have been Apollo, since the satyrs expected to receive their release at his hands; and it has been shown that there is nothing surprising in the introduction of Apollo into the Bacchic thiasus. What is then to be made of σὺν ἐγγόνοις νύμφαισι? In answer it may be remarked that Apollo is often associated with the Nymphs, and that he bore the special title of Νυμφηγέτης at Thasos and at Samos (Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa II 61). That title, however, must be intimately related to, if it is not merely a substitute for, the better-known Μουσηγέτης (Pausan. 1. 2. 5, Pind. fr. 116). Further, since there is respectable authority (Eumel. fr. 17 K.) for the statement that Apollo was the father of the Muses, it is not extravagant to suppose that he might also have been described—particularly in a passage to which his function as Νυμφηγέτης is entirely relevant—as father of the Nymphs. [In *C. R.* XXVI 310 I enumerated the difficulties involved in these lines, and threw out certain suggestions for their removal. But Wilamowitz (*Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 92₃) has shown that ἔν-γονος does not exist, and that ἔγγονος is always ἐκ-γονος. Besides, except as a last resource, we are not justified in disturbing the text.]

εἶχες: see cr. n. εἶπες yields no intelligible meaning, and Wilamowitz's correction seems inevitable [εἶδες in ed. min. is an error].—**νεβρίνῃ**, a new word, corresponding to φήγινος, λάινος, and many others, where the suffix denotes material. See Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.* II p. 156 f. tr.—**καθημμένος**: the νεβρίς was *fastened* at one shoulder and slung across the body so that the folds were below the other. Hence καθάπτω rather than ἐνδύω; for that the former does not mean 'to dress' or 'clothe' may be seen by consulting the examples which L. and S. quote for

ὑμῖν ὃς αἰεὶ νεβρίνῃ καθημμέν[ο]ς
δορᾷ χερ[ο]ῖν τε θύρσ[ο]ν εὐπαλῆ φέρων
ὄπισθεν εὐιάζετ' ἀμφὶ τὸν θεὸν
σὺν ἐγγόνοις νύμφαισι καὶ ποδῶν ὄχλῳ;
νῦν δ' ἀγνοῶ τὸ χρῆμα· ποῖ στροφαὶ νέ[ω]ν
μανιῶν στρέφουσι; θαῦμα γὰρ κατέκλ[υ]ον,
ὁμοῦ πρέπον κέλευμά πως κ[υ]νηγετ[ῶ]ν
ἐγγὺς μολόντων θηρὸς εὐναί[ου] τρο[φ]ῆς,
ὁμοῦ δ' ἂν αὖτι[ς . .] . . αι φωρ[. . .] . . [. .]

219 *υμειν* pap. **221** *εὐιάζετ'* pap.: *εὐίαζες* pap.^{2} | *ζήτ(ει)* in marg. add. pap.^{2}
222 *παίδων* Wilamowitz **223** *νέον* coni. Hunt, quia *νέων* spatium vix continet
224 post *γάρ* interpunxit Hunt | *κατήλυθεν* legisse Theonem testatur pap.^{2}

that sense. Cf. Eur. fr. 752 *θύρσοισι καὶ νεβρῶν δοραῖς καθαπτός*. Nonn. 11. 233 *ὑψόθεν ὤμου | νεβρίδα καὶ ψυχροῖσιν ἐπὶ στέρνοισι καθάψας*. Lucian *Bacch.* 1 *γυναῖκες...νεβρίδας ἐνημμέναι*, Strabo 719 (quoted by Hunt) *καθημμένους νεβρίδας ἢ δορκάδων δοράς*, Eur. *Bacch.* 24 *νεβρίδ' ἐξάψας χροός*.—**εὐπαλῆ**, *habilem*. A chief characteristic of the *thyrsus* was its slenderness: *ἀνὰ θύρσον τε τινάσσων* Eur. *Bacch.* 80. Cf. Lucian *l.c.* *δόρατά τινα μικρὰ ἔχουσαι*. Ov. *Met.* 6. 593 *umero levis incubat hasta*. Stat. *Theb.* 2. 664 *nebridas et fragilis thyrsos portare*.—**εὐιάζετ'** appears to be a Sophoclean middle, for which see on fr. 941, 16. See cr. n., from which it appears that some critic thought that the verb was or ought to be in the second person, and substituted the singular *εὐίαζες* as more appropriate. The presence of *ὑμῖν* may have caused him to add *ζητ.*—**ποδῶν ὄχλῳ**, *dancing rout* (concourse of feet). Cf. Eur. fr. 322 *φιλημάτων ὄχλῳ*. The phrase appears to me quite suitable to a description of the *θίασος*: cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 165 *ἠδομένα δ' ἄρα...κῶλον ἄγει ταχύπουν σκιρτήμασι Βάκχα*. Robert thinks *ποδῶν* impossible, and is inclined to acquiesce in *παίδων*, though he would prefer *καὶ θηρῶν ὄχλῳ* or *Μαινάδων ὄχλῳ*.

223 f. I have altered the punctuation: Hunt prints a comma after *χρῆμα*, with colons following *στρέφουσι* and *γάρ*. He remarks that there is scarcely enough room for *νέων*, but no other supplement seems to be possible.—**στρέφουσι**, of mental agitation, as in Plat. *rep.* 330 D (the stories about Hades) *στρέφουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ ἀληθεῖς ὦσιν*.—**κατέκλυον**: see cr. n. Against *κατήλυθεν* it may be urged that *ἦλυθον* is not used elsewhere by Sophocles in dialogue, and that the meaning of the compound is far from clear. But I fail to understand why Hunt's punctuation (cr. n.) should be considered essential to the adoption of *κατέκλυον*.

225 πρέπον, of sound clearly heard. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 333 *οἶμαι βοὴν ἄμεικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν*. There is a similar transference from sight to sound in 322 f. and in *O. T.* 186 *παιὰν δὲ λάμπει*.

226 θηρὸς εὐναίου τροφῆς: the *brood* of a beast in its lair. For *εὐναῖος* cf. fr. 174, and for the concrete sense of *τροφή* *O.T.* 1 *ὦ τέκνα, Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή*. Eur. *Cycl.* 189 *μηκάδων ἀρνῶν τροφαί*. Wilamowitz, however, reading *εὐναίας*, thinks that *den*, or *lair*, is the meaning required and conjectures *στροφῆς* (coll. *ἐπιστροφαί*, *ἀναστροφαί*).

227 f. are not easy to restore. The sentence appears to be constructed similarly to *Rhes.* 875 *οὐ γὰρ ἐς σὲ τείνεται | γλῶσσ', ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς*. Hence I was inclined to read *αἰτίαι φωρῶν κάτα | γλώσσης ἐτείνοντ' ἐς κλοπὴν ἠνιγμέναι* (or *τετραμμέναι*), but *αἰτίαι* is impossible and *ἐτείνο[ντ'] ἐς* is barely consistent with the traces. Hunt thought that the letter before *αι* was *κ* (*i.e.* *καί*), but could not find a suitable word to precede it which might be the subject of *ἐτείνετ'*. He also believed that *εναι* was the remnant of a perfect infinitive; but it would be difficult to accommodate one to the context. **ἄν** appears to be iterative. **αὖτις**, which the recurrence in 229 makes almost certain (*ἀν' αὐλήν*, Murray), is proved to be Attic by the new Menander (*Epitr.* 362, *Sam.* 281, 292). See Wila-

γλώσσης ἐτεινε[. ε]ἰς κλοπὴν [. . . . .] . έναι·
αὗτις δ' α[. . . .]τ[. . . .] . . μένων [. . . . .]α
κηρυκ[. .] . . ι [. . . . .] . κηρυγμα[. . .
καὶ τ[α]ῦτ' ἀφεῖσα σὺν ποδῶν λακ[τίσμασι
[κ]ληδὼν ὁμοῦ πάμφυρ[τ]' ἐγειτν[ία στέγη.]
[καὶ] ταῦτ' ἂν ἄλλως ἢ κλ[.] . . . . . μ[. . . . .]
[φων]ῶν ἀκούσασ' ὧδε παραπεπαισμέν[ων
. . . [. . .]φ . [.]η[.] . . . . νων ὑμᾶς νοσεῖν
νο[. . . τί νύμφη]ν ἔτι ποεῖτ' ἀναιτίαν;
Col. x ΧΟ. νύμφα βαθύζωνε π[αῦσαι χόλου (στρ.)
τοῦδ', οὔτε γὰρ νεῖκος ἢ[κω φέρων
δά[ο]υ μάχας οὐδ' ἄξενό[ς που σέθεν

238 supplevit Diehl | *υ* inseruit pap.[2] **239** sq. supplevit Murray | *νύμφη* pap.

mowitz in *Sitzungsb. k. Pr. Akad.*, 1907 p. 872. Hitherto it has been treated as Ionic by the authorities (Weir Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, p. 298). L. gives *αὖτις* in *O. C.* 234 and elsewhere, and the editors have perhaps been too hasty in rejecting it. See also fr. 599.

231 The description evidently passes to the conduct initiated at 211.—**σύν**, restored by Murray where the papyrus is illegible, is considered by Hunt not entirely satisfactory.

232 **πάμφυρτ'**, *confusedly*, is the adverbial acc. commonly found with verbs of motion. See Jebb on *Ai.* 196. Eur. *Hel.* 455 (n.), *Phoen.* 311 (n.).

233 The meaning may be 'otherwise than in the actual circumstances' (*e.g.* *ἢ* [*οὐ εἰ*] *κλύουσ' ἐμάνθανον*).

234 **παραπεπαισμένων**, *mad*, *foolish* (from *παραπαίω*, which is also used absolutely = *deliro*). Cf. Lucian *hist. conscr.* 2 *ἥκιστα γὰρ ἂν τοῦτο παράπαιον.* Hesych. III pp. 271, 275 s.vv. *παράπαισμα* (*παραίπαιμα*), *παράπαιστος*.

235 f. Hunt states that *φαίην ἄν* is more suitable to the conditions than *ἔφην ἄν*, and suggests some such context as *αἰναῖσι φρενῶν* (*δαιμόνων*) *νόσοις*, adding however that *ἂν φρενῶν* cannot both be read. In 236 the first five letters after the gap are doubtful, and *ἔτι ποεῖτ'* is hardly satisfactory. *ἔπτοεῖτ'*, which Hunt reluctantly gives up, is said to be inconsistent with the remains.

237 ff. The ode corresponds to 283 ff., as appears from the number of the lines and the equivalence of 244 to 290. The metre, which is quite simple, is iambic (cretic). The ithyphallic clausula may be illustrated by *Ant.* 852, 976, *El.* 1089. The ends of the lines have been admirably restored by Diehl, Murray, Hunt, and Wilamowitz.

νύμφα: see on 65.—**βαθύζωνε**: the word is now generally distinguished from *βαθύκολπος*, but its original (Homeric) meaning is uncertain. Helbig, who formerly explained it as 'long-waisted' from *ε* 231, has since changed his mind and now agrees with Studniczka that the meaning is 'slender, with small waist.' (Iwan Mueller, *Privatalt.*[2] p. 83.) *βαθύζωνος* does not occur in Eur. or elsewhere in Soph., and in Aesch. the commentators are not agreed whether it is merely an ornamental epithet applicable to any woman, or carries with it an implication of luxury and delicate nurture (see Verrall and Tucker on *Theb.* 850 and *Cho.* 168). In Pindar it is applied to Leda, Latona, the Graces, and the Muses (Gildersleeve on *Ol.* 3. 37), and it is a fair inference that Sophocles used it as a complimentary epithet to signify beautiful proportions and elegant apparel.

238 **ἥκω φέρων** (cr. n.), as in *O. C.* 357, 579, *Phil.* 1267, is better than Murray's *ἥκει σέ τοι* (cf. for the acc. fr. 94).

239 **οὐδ'**. If the text is right, *οὐδέ* is intended to contrast the second clause instead of correlating it. That is to say, it would imply: 'no, nor yet....' Where this is intended, we often have *οὐδ' αὖ*, *οὐδέ γε*, etc.: Kuehner-Gerth II 290. See also Bury on Pind. *Isthm.* 2. 44. In *O.C.* 1141 Jebb accepted Elmsley's *οὔτε*,

γλ[ῶ]σσ' ἂν μάταιός τ[' ἀφ' ἡμῶν θίγοι. 240
μή με μὴ προψαλ[άξῃς κακοῖς,
ἀλλ' [εὖ]πετῶς μοι πρ[όφανον τὸ πρᾶγ-
μ', ἐν [τ]όποις τοῖσ[δε τίς νέρθε γᾶς ὧδ' ἀγα-
στῶς ἐγάρυσε θέσπιν αὐδά[ν;
ΚΤ. ταῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκείνων νῦν [τρόπων πεπαίτερα, 245
καὶ τοῖσδε θηρῶν ἐκπύ[θοιο μᾶλλον ἂν
ἀλκασμάτ[ω]ν δ[ειλῆ]ς [τε πειρατηρίων
νύμφης· ἐμοὶ γὰ[ρ οὐ]κ [ἀρεστόν ἐστ' ἔριν
ὀρθοψάλακτον ἐν [λ]όγο[ισ]ιν [ἱστάναι.
ἀλλ' ἥσυχος πρόφαινε καὶ μ[ή]νυ[έ μοι 250
ὅτου μάλιστα πράγματος χρείαν ἔχεις.
ΧΟ. τόπων ἄνασσα τῶν[δ]ε, Κυλλήνης σθένος,
ὅτου μὲν οὕνεκ' ἦλθ[ο]ν ὕστερον φράσω·

241 *μή* pap.[2]: *μηδέ* pap. **242** sq. supplevit Wilamowitz **244** in textu omissum, in marg. superiore add. pap.[2] **245—249** suppleverunt Murray et Hunt **247** *λακασμάτων* coni. Wilamowitz

and it is not clear that *οὐδ'* is justified here.—**ἄξενος**, *uncivil*, as in Plat. *soph.* 217 E *τὸ δὲ αὖ σοὶ μὴ χαρίζεσθαι...ἄξενόν τι καταφαίνεταί μοι καὶ ἄγριον.*

240 μάταιος, expressing the presumption of rash folly, as (in another sphere) in *Trach.* 565 *ψαύει ματαίαις χερσίν.* Such recklessness of speech was exhibited by Lycurgus: *Ant.* 961 *ψαύων τὸν θεὸν ἐν κερτομίοις γλώσσαις.*

241 προψαλάξῃς: see on fr. 550. Here the meaning is: 'don't assail me too soon with taunts.'

242 εὐπετῶς: *readily.* So Eur. *Cycl.* 526 *ὅπου τιθῇ τις, ἐνθάδ' ἐστὶν εὐπετής* ('contented').

243 νέρθε γᾶς is of course only a guess, although it suits the context very well. If the sound of the lyre was represented as coming from under the ground, it would agree with *κάτω δονεῖ* (282). Robert thinks that is why the chorus went on all fours (119 ff.): see also on 212.

244 θέσπιν αὐδάν sounds like a travesty of Homer's *θέσπιν ἀοιδήν* (*θ* 498), which, by a curious coincidence, is applied by Euripides to the music of the *lyre* (*Med.* 425).

245 ff. The restorations of these lines clearly satisfy the sense, even if they do not represent the actual words of the original.

247 ἀλκασμάτων might signify 'violent attacks,' since *ἀλκάζειν· μάχεσθαι* appears in *Etym. M.* p. 56, 10; 66, 10. But λακασμάτων (cr. n.), 'howlings,' would be much more to the point. For the gen. (= *ἢ ἀλκάσμασιν*) cf. *Ant.* 74 *ἐπεὶ πλείων χρόνος | ὃν δεῖ μ' ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κάτω τῶν ἐνθάδε, O.C.* 567 *τῆς ἐς αὖριον | οὐδὲν πλέον μοι σοῦ μέτεστιν ἡμέρας.* Kuehner-Gerth II 308.

249 ὀρθοψάλακτον is interpreted by Hunt as 'shrill-sounding' (as if for *ὀρθιο—*). The point is obscure owing to the rarity of *ψαλάσσω*, but it might be suggested that the force of *ὀρθός* is the same as in fr. 1077. Then the whole compound would mean 'violently roused'; but it must be admitted that this meaning would not suit 321, where see n.

252 This speech is given by Hunt to the coryphaeus (see on 199 ff.), but by Wilamowitz and Robert to Silenus. Reasons have already been given for agreeing with the former view, and I cannot assent to Robert's argument that in that case *ἦλθον* should have been *ἤλθομεν.*—**σθένος.** For the periphrasis, which is also Homeric, cf. *Trach.* 507 *ὃ μὲν ἦν ποταμοῦ σθένος.*

254 See cr. n. Theon's variant is clearly inferior, however we interpret the text. Hunt rendered 'tell us of this voice which resounds'; but, if that is

τὸ φθέγμα δ' ἡμῖν τοῦ[θ'] ὅπερ φωνεῖ φράσον
καὶ τίς ποτ' αὐτῷ δι[α]χαράσσεται βροτῶν.
ΚΥ. ὑμᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς χρὴ τάδ' εἰδέναι σαφῶς
ὡς εἰ φανεῖτε τὸν λ[ό]γον τὸν ἐξ ἐμοῦ,
αὐτοῖσιν ὑμ[ῖν ζ]ημία πορίζεται.
καὶ γὰρ κέκρυπ[ται] τοὔργον ἐν [θ]ε[ῶ]ν ἕδραις,
Ἥραν ὅπως μ[ὴ πύ]στ[ι]ς ἵξετα[ι λ]όγου.
Ζ[εὺ]ς γ[ὰρ] κρυφ[αίαν ἐς στέ]γην Ἀτλαντίδος
[. . . . . .]εύσατο
[. . . . . .]υ . [.] φίλας
Col. xi [. . . . . .] λήθῃ τῆς βαθυζώνου θεᾶς.
[κατὰ σπέ]ος δὲ παῖδ' ἐφίτυσεν μόνον.
[τοῦτον δὲ] χερσὶ ταῖς ἐμαῖς ἐγὼ τρέφω·

254 τοῦτο πῶς φωνεῖ legisse Theonem testatur pap.², τοῦθ' ὃ περιφωνεῖ H. Richards

the meaning, he was well advised in the *ed. min.* to accept ὃ περιφωνεῖ, the ingenious correction of H. Richards. The objection to this course is that φράζω is not used by Soph. with an accusative of the direct object in the sense of 'to explain.' It is simpler therefore to regard **ὅπερ φωνεῖ** as an object-clause: 'tell us what this sound means.' Cf. *Phil.* 559 φράσον δ' ἅπερ γ' ἔλεξας. *O.T.* 655 φράζε δὴ τί φῄς.

255 αὐτῷ διαχαράσσεται is rendered by Hunt 'expresses himself therewith.' But that is hard to justify, and I should prefer to suppose that there is an allusion to the sound of the πλῆκτρον as it *scrapes across* the strings of the lyre. Cf. Plut. *de soll. an.* 20 p. 974 B ὁ δὲ δράκων τῷ μαρίθρῳ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἀμβλυώττοντα λεπτύνων καὶ διαχαράττων. We might render: 'who in the world is setting our teeth on edge with it?' Compare the contemptuous use of *catgut-scraper* and the like in English; for the humour of the situation was enhanced by the satyrs' lack of musical appreciation. Wilamowitz seems to recognize this by the reference to 'Silen, dem sie (Musik) durch Mark und Bein geht' (p. 451 f.), but refuses to admit that the παρεπιγραφή (ῥοῖβδος 107) can be used for the sound of the lyre. Rossbach's conjecture αὐτὸ διαχαρίζεται is mistaken.

257 τὸν ἐξ ἐμοῦ, an emphatic variation for τὸν ἐμόν, occurs also in *Trach.* 631 τὸν πόθον τὸν ἐξ ἐμοῦ. *Ant.* 95 τὴν ἐξ ἐμοῦ δυσβουλίαν.

258 ζημία πορίζεται: 'punishment is in store for you, in case you reveal. . .' The apodosis to εἰ φανεῖτε is contained in ζημία, and πορίζεται is unconditional. Cf. Isocr. 4. 157 ἀρὰς ποιοῦνται, εἴ τις ἐπικηρυκεύεται Πέρσαις, quoted by Goodwin § 490.

260 ὅπως μὴ..ἵξεται. For the future indicative with ὅπως μή in a pure final clause see Goodwin § 324. From Sophocles is quoted *Phil.* 1068 μὴ προσλεύσσε..ἡμῶν ὅπως μὴ τὴν τύχην διαφθερεῖς. Another instance is *El.* 954 εἰς σὲ δὴ βλέπω, | ὅπως τὸν αὐτόχειρα..μὴ κατοκνήσεις κτανεῖν, where however Jebb prefers to regard εἰς σὲ βλέπω as equivalent to a verb of entreaty, and as followed by an object clause accordingly.

262 ff. Hunt supplies τήνδ' ἧκε, κἀξέπραξεν ἀβουλεύσατο, after Murray. Rossbach preferred στέγην, Ἀτλαντίδος | σεμνῆς ἔρωτος ὡς ἅπαξ ἐγεύσατο, | ἔκρυψεν αὐτὴν ἀπῆλθε λήθῃ κτέ. But Terzaghi is perhaps right in requiring that Maia's name should be mentioned here. One might guess for 263 νύμφης ἱκέσθαι πρὸς χέρας σπεύδων φίλας, | εὐνῆς τε, in which case θεᾶς would refer to Hera, as is suggested by *h. Herm.* 6—9.

265 μόνον cannot be taken with σπέος in the sense of ἔρημον, but apparently belongs to παῖδα,—'an only child.' Cf. Eur. *Andr.* 1083 (Peleus refers to Neoptolemus) παῖς μόνον παιδὸς μόνος.

266 The association of Cyllene with Hermes as his nurse is mentioned also by Philostephanus (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 6. 129) ἐν τῷ περὶ Κυλλήνης (*FHG* III 30), and Festus *s.v. Cyllenius*. Robert (p. 553)

[μητρὸς γ]ὰρ ἰσχὺς ἐν νόσῳ χειμάζεται·
[κἄδεσμ]α καὶ ποτῆτα καὶ κοιμήματα
[πρὸς σπ]αργάνοις μένουσα λικνῖτιν τροφὴν
[ἐξευθ]ετίζω νύκτα καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν. 270
[ὁ δ' α]ὔξεται κατ' ἦμαρ οὐκ ἐπεικότα
[ἄπαυ]στος, ὥστε θαῦμα καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει.
[οὔπω γ]ὰρ ἔκτον ἦμαρ ἐκπεφασμέν[ο]ς
[τύπου]ς ἐρείδει παιδὸς εἰς ἥβης ἀκμήν,
[κἀξορ]μενίζει κοὐκέτι σχολάζεται 275

268 κἄδεσμα Bucherer: κάδεστὰ Wilamowitz **272** ἄπαυστος supplevi: μέγιστος Hunt **273** ἡμέρας πεφασμένος in marg. add. pap.^{2} **274** τύπους supplevi: γυίοις Wilamowitz **275** ἐπισχολάζεται Athenaei et Eustathii codd.: correxerat Meineke

is probably right in inferring that Sophocles was the ultimate authority for the statement, and that his object was to avoid the necessity of making Maia confess to her intrigue with Zeus.

267 χειμάζεται is often applied to physical pain: *Phil.* 1459 Ἑρμαῖον ὄρος παρέπεμψεν ἐμοὶ | στόνον ἀντίτυπον χειμαζομένῳ. *Ai.* 206 Αἴας θολερῷ | κεῖται χειμῶνι νοσήσας. The metaphor, though strange to us, was quite familiar to the Greeks, so that χειμών, χειμάζεσθαι, etc. became technical in medical circles. For examples see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 387. Epicur. fr. 452 Us. τὴν σάρκα τὸ παρὸν μόνον χειμάζειν.

268 κἄδεσμα (cr. n.), as co-ordinate with the other substantives, is preferable to ἑδεστά, which Hunt accepted.

269 λικνῖτιν. The word λίκνον comes from *h. Herm.* 21. 150, etc. Miss J. E. Harrison in *J. H. S.* XXIII 294 gives reproductions from art of the λίκνον used as a cradle, in one of which Hermes is represented sitting up, and looking at the stolen cows. 'The liknon-cradle is a wickerwork shoe-shaped basket with two handles.'

270 ἐξευθετίζω is a plausible restoration, although the compound is new.—**νύκτα καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν**, night and day alike. Cf. *El.* 259 κατ' ἦμαρ καὶ κατ' εὐφρόνην ἀεί, and for the absence of the prep. with the first noun *ib.* 780 οὔτε νυκτὸς..οὔτ' ἐξ ἡμέρας. Eur. *Bacch.* 1009 ἦμαρ εἰς νύκτα τε.

272 ἄπαυστος: I have adopted this supplement in preference to μέγιστος, as being more suitable to αὔξεται.

273 ἔκτον ἦμαρ. This is a deviation, prompted by dramatic conditions, from the version of the hymn (17 f.), according to which Hermes, after inventing the lyre in the morning, stole the cattle on the evening of the day of his birth. For a possible ritual significance see F. M. Cornford, *Origin of Attic Comedy*, p. 87. The marginal variant (see cr. n.), in Robert's opinion, implies that the alternative reading was ἐννέ' ἡμέρας πεφασμένος, since no other numeral is adaptable to it.—**ἐκπεφασμένος**, *brought forth*, as in Hom. T 104 σήμερον ἄνδρα φόωσδε μογοστόκος εἰλείθυια | ἐκφανεῖ.

274 See cr. n. The objection to γυίοις is not that it cannot be combined with **παιδός** (which then follows ἥβης), but that the instrumental dative, though grammatically possible, involves an unnatural harshness of expression. I formerly conjectured μέτροις, but now prefer **τύπους**, which simplifies the construction by providing ἐρείδει with an object. With τύπους παιδός, 'his childish mould,' cf. Eur. *Hclid.* 857 νέων βραχιόνων..ἠβητὴν τύπον. Aesch. *Suppl.* 288 γυναικείοις τύποις. Soph. *Trach.* 12 (according to the MSS) ἀνδρείῳ τύπῳ. So also Aesch. *Theb.* 475, Eur. *Bacch.* 1331.

275 f. Athen. 62 F Ἀττικοὶ δ' εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες ὅρμενον τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κράμβης ἐξηνθηκότα. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰχνευταῖς 'κἀξορμενίζει κοὐκ ἐπισχολάζεται βλάστη' (fr. 294 N.^{2}). The same quotation occurs in Eustath. *Il.* p. 899, 17, but without the name of the play, and with the variant κἀξορμενίζειν οὐκ. Meineke corrected ἐπισχολάζεται to ἔτι σχολάζεται, and his view is now confirmed by the papyrus. For the remarkable use of the middle see *supr.* 221.—**ἐξορμενίζει.** The meaning of the word is made clear by the following evidence. Phryn. *praep. soph.* p. 67, 16 (Bekk. *anecd.* p. 38, 17) ἐξορμεν-

[βλάστη·] τοιόνδε παῖδα θησαυρὸς στέγει.
[κατάσχε]τος [δ' ἔτ]' ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρὸς θέσει.
ἀφ[. . . . . φ]θέγμα μηχανῇ βρέμ[ον
καὶ π[όλ]λ' ἐθά[μβεις, αὐτὸ]ς ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ
ἐξ ὑπτίας κ[. . . . . ἐμηχ]ανήσατο·
τοιόνδε θη[ρὸς ἐκ θανόντ]ος ἡδονῆς
ἔμμεστον ἀ[. . . . . κ]αὶ κάτω δ[ονεῖ].
ΧΟ. ἄφρασ[το . . . . . .] παῖς βοᾶς (ἀντιστρ.)
παιδο[. . . . . .]μαζεισ[
θηρευμ[α . . . . . .]· λέγει[ς
φωνημ[α . . . . . .]σεθου[
τόνδ' ἀφ[. . . . . .]ον[
τως ἐξεφ[. . . . . .]
ροντ' ἄπα[. . . . . .] ἐ[κ θανόν-
Col. xii τος πορίζειν τοιάνδε γᾶρυν.
ΚΥ. μή νυν ἀπίστε[ι]· πιστὰ γάρ σε προσγελᾷ θεᾶς ἔπη.

276 στέγει ex τέγει corr., etiam τρέφει in marg. add. pap.[2] **277** κατάσχετος supplev.: δυσεύρετος Murray **278** φθεγγμ pap. **283** βοης pap. **288** τὼς pap. **290** γῆρυν pap.

ἰζειν· τὸ ἐξανθεῖν, ὅπερ οἱ πολλοὶ ἐκβάλλειν λέγουσιν. ὁρμενα γὰρ καλεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀττικῶν τὰ τῶν λαχάνων ἐξανθήματα. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀμαθεῖς ταῦτα ἀσπαράγους καλοῦσιν. Hesych. II p. 127 ἐξορμενίζεις· ἐκκεκαύληκας, ἐκκέχυσαι. Pollux 6. 54 πᾶν δὲ τὸ ὑπερεξηνθηκός, ὅπερ ἐκκεκαυληκὸς καλοῦσιν, ὁρμενὸν ὠνόμαζον· καὶ τὸ ὑπέρωρόν τι γενέσθαι, ἐξορμενίσαι. From the last passage it seems that ἐξορμενίζειν might be used for *to run to seed*, but here we should render simply 'sprouts forth.' Nicostr. fr. 34 (II 228 K.) ῥήτορες | ἐξωρμενικότες, δυσχερεῖς, παλιναίρετοι.—**θησαυρός**: *i.e.* the cavern, as a place securely protected against intrusion. Similarly in Eur. *Suppl.* 1010 Διὸς θησαυρὸν is applied to the *bidental* of Capaneus (ἄβατον). Miss Harrison (*Essays to Ridgeway*, p. 140), however, understands that the cave-dwelling was an under-ground storehouse or granary like the σιροί of fr. 276.

277 **κατάσχετος** has been preferred to δυσεύρετος on the ground that a word expressing intentional concealment is required.—**θέσει**, which does not occur elsewhere in tragedy, is probably rather *disposition* than *command*.

278 ff. For the palaeographical data see Hunt's n. While decisively rejecting it, he indicates a possibility that the beginnings of the lines 278–289, which are on a separate fragment, should be moved a line lower down. In 278 Hunt's ἀφανεῖ δ' ὃ πεύθῃ φθέγμα appears to suit the context; for, although φθέγμα ἐμηχανήσατο is an odd phrase, it is justified by 320. In 280 **ἐμηχανήσατο** seems inevitable, but it is difficult to find a suitable supplement; for, as Hunt remarks, 'neither κιστης, κάλπης (Murray), nor κόγχης is convincing.' On the other hand, **θηρὸς ἐκ θανόντος** and **δονεῖ**, which were proposed by Wilamowitz, are highly probable, and the same critic's ἄγγος εὗρε (or ηὗρε?) καί is an attractive conjecture.—**κάτω**: *i.e.* in the θησαυρός. Cf. 243 n. For δονεῖν = to make a vibrating sound, see Bury on Pind. *Nem.* 7. 80.

283 f. Rossbach proposes ἄφραστον ἦν φθέγμα μοι, but that does not fit the following words. The lines are too much mutilated to be capable of restoration.

291 For the metre of this and the following lines see Introductory Note.—**νυν**, long before a vowel: Eur. *Hel.* 1419 n.—**πιστά** κτέ. 'For true are the words wherewith a goddess thrills your ear.'—**προσγελᾷ** implies that the recital has excited the emotions of the chorus. Cf. Aesch. *Prom.* 861 τῶνδε προσσαίνει σέ τι; *Eum.* 253 ὀσμὴ βροτείων αἱμάτων με προσγελᾷ. Soph. *Ant.* 1214 παιδός με σαίνει φθόγγος. Eur. *Hipp.* 862 τύποι γε

ΧΟ. καὶ πῶς πίθωμαι τοῦ θανόντος φθέγμα τοιοῦτον βρέμειν;
ΚΤ. πιθοῦ· θανὼν γὰρ ἔσχε φωνήν, ζῶν δ' ἄναυδος ἦν ὁ θήρ.
ΧΟ. ποῖός τις ἦν εἶδος; πρ[ο]μήκης, ἢ 'πίκυρτος, ἢ βραχύς;
ΚΤ. βραχὺς χυτρώδης πο[ι]κίλῃ δορᾷ κατερρικνωμένος.
ΧΟ. ὡς αἰέλουρος εἰκάσαι πέφυκεν ἢ τως πόρδαλις; 296
ΚΤ. πλεῖστον με[τ]αξύ· γογγύλον γάρ ἐστι καὶ βραχυσκελές.
ΧΟ. οὐδ' ὡς ἰχνευτῇ προσφερὲς πέφυκεν οὐδ' ὡς καρκίνῳ;
ΚΤ. οὐδ' αὖ τοιοῦτ[ό]ν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἄλλον τιν' ἐξευροῦ τρόπον.
ΧΟ. ἀλλ' ὡς κεράστ[η]ς κάνθαρος δῆτ' ἐστὶν Αἰτναῖος φυήν; 300
ΚΤ. νῦν ἐγγὺς ἔγν[ως] ᾧ μάλιστα προσφερὲς τὸ κνώδαλον.
ΧΟ. τ[ί δ' αὖ τὸ] φων[οῦ]ν ἐστιν αὐτοῦ, τοὐντὸς ἢ τοὔξω, φράσο[ν.

292 $\bar{\gamma}$ in marg. trecentesimo versui adscriptum **293** *τῶν δ' ἄναυδος* pap., *ζῶν δὲ νη*[*ῦδος?*] in marg. add. pap.[2] **295** *χυτροιδης* pap., *τροχοιδη*[*ς*] in marg. pap.[2] **298** *ιχνευμ*[*ο*]*νι* pap. secundum ed. pr.: corr. Zielinski, *ἰχνευτῇ* in pap. iam invenit Hunt

σφενδόνης χρυσηλάτου...προσσαίνουσί με. Rhes. 55 *σαίνει μ' ἔννυχος φρυκτωρία* (of something which demands notice). The fact that the hearer sometimes experiences pleasure is accidental: the essential point is that the signs are presented in a form which compels attention.

292 τοῦ θανόντος φθέγμα: For the retention of the article—'that such a sound can come from the dead'—see on fr. 870.

293 See cr. n. The riddle is taken from *h. Herm.* 38 *ἦν δὲ θάνῃς, τότε κεν μάλα καλὸν ἀείδοις*. Cf. Nic. *Al.* 560 (χελώνην) *αὐδήεσσαν ἔθηκεν, ἀναύδητόν περ ἐοῦσαν*. Pacuv. *Antiop.* fr. IV *quadrupes tardigrada agrestis humilis aspera, | brevi capite, cervice anguina, aspectu truci, | eviscerata inanima cum animali sono*. For the bearing of the last passage on the question of the date of this play see Introductory Note, p. 230.

294 ἐπίκυρτος: *arched.*

295 χυτρώδης: *'pot-shaped.* Cf. schol. Theocr. 5. 58 *γαυλοὶ ἀγγεῖα χυτροειδῆ γαλακτοδόχα*. But it is difficult to say whether this word or *τροχώδης* was the gloss (see cr. n.).—**κατερρικνωμένος**: *shrivelled.* Cf. Callim. fr. 49 *ναὶ μὰ τὸ ῥικνὸν | σῦφαρ ἐμόν*. Hunt renders it 'curved,' but see Suid. *s.v. κατερρικνωμένον. συνεστραμμένον, κάμπυλον γενόμενον, ἐρρυτιδωμένον*, where the last gloss applies to the present passage. Fr. 316 should not be taken to be a reference to this line.

296 αἰέλουρος. The form is established as Sophoclean by fr. 986.—**τως** here clearly = *ὡς*. This may also be the case in Aesch. *Theb.* 624, where the edd. strive to construe it as *thus*. See also Ar. *Ach.* 762, where the Megarian is speaking. Stahl however corrects to *χώς*.

298 See cr. n. The recovery of the true reading makes it unnecessary to consider Wilamowitz's *ἰχνεύμων* and *κάρκινος*, which were adopted in both of Hunt's editions: for the fact that *ὡς* follows *πέφυκεν* (*ἐστὶν...φυήν*) in 296 and 300 shows that here also it is employed in the same way: 'is he not then the very image of an ichneumon?' I now think (with Maas) that *ἰχνευτής* = *ἰχνεύμων*. Certainly *βραχυσκελές* suits the ichneumon, and *γογγύλον* might be explained by Aelian's *ἐγκυλίσας ἑαυτόν* (*nat. an.* 3. 22).

300 f. This is the climax of absurdity, and is fresh evidence (fr. 162 n.) that

ΚΤ. [. . . . .]λο[. . .]ορίνη σύγγονος τῶ<ν ὀ>στράκων.

ΧΟ. [ποῖον δὲ τοὔνομ' ἐν]νέ[πει]ς; πόρσυνον, εἴ τι πλ[έ]ον ἔχεις.

ΚΤ. [τὸν θῆρα μὲν χέλυν, τὸ φωνο]ῦν δ' αὖ λύραν ὁ π[αῖς κ]αλεῖ. 305

ΧΟ. [22 litt.] . κτέανον ησυ[. . .] . τινι;

ΚΤ. [23 „] δέρμα κ[. .]στ . [

[„ „]ον ὧδ[ε] κλαγγά[νει

[„ „]όρως ἐρείδετα[ι

[24 „] πλεκτα . [310

303 *ορεινη* (*ε* postea deleto) pap. | *τωστρακρεων* pap. : *συγγονοις οστρα*[legisse Theonem in marg. testatur pap.^{2} **307** *κώστρακον* coni. Wilamowitz

'Aetnaean beetle' was the ludicrous image of an unfamiliar object. See *C.R.* XXVIII 224. In regard to **κεράστης** Viljoen answers that horned beetles are actually found in Sicily. That is not surprising, but what we are here concerned with is the horned beetle *of the Aetnaean strain*. If the horned beetle is so much larger than other species, how much more terrific was the horned Aetnaean beetle which could speak after death.—Cyllene gravely assents: for **ἐγγύς** see on fr. 210, 38.

303 **ορίνη**. If this is a compound of *βιός*, cf. *κελαινόρινος* (*κελαινόρινες* fr. 29 n.), *κοσκινόρινος*, and for the feminine termination *συρ.* 168. *ὀρεινή*, the original reading, which seems to have been corrected, would of course be a suitable epithet of the tortoise (*ὀρεσκῴοιο χελώνης h. Herm.* 42). For **ὀστράκων** cf. *h. Herm.* 32 *πόθεν τοδε καλὸν ἄθυρμα | αὐλὸν ὀστρακον ἔσσο*; Wilamowitz thought that the reading of the papyrus was a fusion of *ὀστράκων* and *ὀστρύων*.

306 Mekler pointed out that *ἤσιχος* and its oblique cases were equally unsuitable to the gap. If *η* is rightly read it must apparently be the disjunctive *ἤ*, and we might conjecture *πῶς δ' ἂν γένοιτο φλύτερον τὸ κτέανον ἢ σθρίγξ τινι*; In that case, we should have to suppose that the stichomythia ends with this question, which gives occasion for a description by Cyllene of the remarkable qualities of the lyre.

307 **δέρμα** is no doubt the hide of the oxen: cf. 337 ff., 366. It has been pointed out in the Introductory Note that Apollodorus represents the ox-hide as used for the construction of the strings. Sophocles clearly gave a different account, but the verses of the Homeric hymn (47 ff.), which he probably intended to follow, are unfortunately disputed: *τῆξε δ' ἀρ' ἐν μέτροισι ταμὼν δόνακας καλάμοιο, | πειρήνας διὰ νῶτα διὰ ῥινοῖο χελώνης, | ἁμφὶ δὲ δέρμα τάνυσσε βοὸς πραπίδεσσιν ἐῇσι*. On this Allen and Sikes write: 'the reeds were cut in different lengths, and fixed in the shell; they thus served as a framework for the ox-hide which was stretched over them, to form a sounding-board.' I see nothing in the mutilated text of Sophocles, which prevents us from supposing that he interpreted Homer in this way; but Robert (p. 557) insists that the fret or bridge (cf. fr. 36 n.), the yoke, and the *πήχεις* were all denominated *δόνακες*, and that the ox-hide was especially employed 'to cover the ends of the bridge so as to keep it fast and prevent displacement.' Schenkl, who lays stress on the interpretation of *κόλλοψ* in Eustath. *Od.* p. 1915, 7, holds that fresh ox-hide was wrapped round the lower fret chiefly to prevent drying and cracking, and that this process was described in 312 f.—*δέρμα καὶ στέγος φέρει*, Viljoen. Wilamowitz suggests **κώστρακον** to follow *δέρμα*.

308 **κλαγγάνει**: cf. fr. 959.

309 Schenkl completes the line by adapting the corrupt fr. 315 so as to run: *ἑπήλατα ξύλ' ὡς τρίγωμφα διατόρως ἐρείδεται*. This is very ingenious, and he is entitled to appeal to the aptness of the comparison between the structure of the lyre and the framework of a bed. But, even after the necessary changes introduced by Schenkl, the words do not seem to cohere with the previous line.

[24 litt. κοι]λάδος κ[
[21 ,, κόλ]λοπες δε[
[24 ,,]αμματω[
[25 ,,]ον[
desunt versus unus vel duo

Col. xiii καὶ τοῦτο λύπη[ς] ἔστ' ἄκεστρον καὶ παραψυκ[τ]ήρ[ιο]ν
κείνῳ μόνον, χα[ί]ρει δ' ἀλύων καί τι προσφων[ῶν μέλος
ξύμφωνον· ἐξα[ί]ρει γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰόλισμα τῆς λ[ύ]ρας.
οὕτως ὁ παῖς θανόντι θηρὶ φθέγμ' ἐμηχανήσατ[ο. 320
5 ΧΟ. ὀ<ρθο>ψάλακτός τις ὀμφὰ κατοιχνεῖ τόπου, (στρ.

311 *κοιλάδος* supplevit Mekler **313** *ο* supra primum *α* add. pap.[2] **318** *ἀλυίων* pap. **321** *ὀρθοψάλακτος* Murray: *οψαλακτος* pap., *ἀπροψάλακτος* Wilamowitz | *ὀμφὴ* pap.

311 κοιλάδος was restored by Mekler, as the tortoise-shell sounding-board (*ἠχεῖον*). He cited Bekk. *anecd.* p. 752, 11 *Ἑρμῆς ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ ἀναστρεφόμενος εὗρε χελώνην καὶ διακόψας ἐποίησε κοιλίαν λύρας.* Gemoll on *h. Herm.* 416. This seems better than Schenkl's *κέλαδος*.

312 κόλλοπες were the pegs by means of which the strings were fastened to the *ζυγόν*. Cf. Hom. *φ* 407 *ῥηιδίως ἐτάνυσσε νέῳ περὶ κόλλοπι χορδήν*.

313 See cr. n. Schenkl suggests *καθαμμάτων* from Poll. 4. 60.

317 f. For the general sense cf. Shakesp. *Henry VIII* iii. 1. 12 *In sweet music is such art, | killing care and grief of heart | fall asleep, or, hearing, die.*—**ἄκεστρον**: fr. 480.—**παραψυκτήριον** is a word hitherto unrecorded.—**ἀλύων**. The unfamiliar sound is regarded as a sign of distraction. For the fact see *h. Herm.* 53 *πλήκτρῳ ἐπειρήτιζε κατὰ μέρος, | ἣ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς | σμερδαλέον κονάβησε· θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν | ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίης πειρώμενος*. Observe that **μόνον**, 'he has nothing else to comfort him,' prepares the way for *ἀλύων* ('he is crazy with delight'), which in its turn is justified by **ἐξαίρει**. Cf. Bekk. *anecd.* p. 380, 20, giving *ἐπαίρεσθαι καὶ χαίρειν* as a gloss on Hom. *σ* 333. There is thus no need for Bucherer's *ἀθύρων*.

319 ἐξαίρει, *elates*. Cf. *El.* 1460 *εἴ τις αὐτῶν ἐλπίσιν κεναῖς πάρος | ἐξῆρετ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε*. But a still closer parallel is to be found in Eur. *Alc.* 346 *οὔτ' ἂν φρέν ἐξαίροιμι πρὸς Λίβυν λακεῖν | αὐλόν*.—**αἰόλισμα τῆς λύρας**, 'the lyre's varied notes' rather than 'the cunning device of the lyre' (Hunt). Cf. Eur. *Ion* 498 *συρίγγων ὑπ' αἰόλας ἰαχᾶς ὕμνων*. Carm. pop. 8 (*PLG* p. 657) *ἁπλοῦν ῥυθμὸν χέοντες αἰόλῳ μέλει*. Oppian *Hal.* 728 *ἀηδόνος αἰολοφώνου*. For the description as especially suitable to the lyre see Pind. *Ol.* 3. 8 *φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν*. 4. 2 *ὑπὸ ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς*. *Nem.* 4. 14 *ποικίλον κιθαρίζων*. Plat. *legg.* 812 D *τὴν δ' ἑτεροφωνίαν καὶ ποικιλίαν τῆς λύρας*.

321 The short ode which begins here corresponds metrically to 362 ff. The metre is similar to 237 ff.—**ὀρθοψάλακτος**, 'loud': cf. 249. *οψαλακτος* (see cr. n.) is meaningless, and 362 indicates that one extra syllable is required, so that I follow Hunt in adopting Murray's conjecture, but without much confidence that it is right. Wilamowitz does not explain his *ἀπροψάλακτος*, which, though presumably based on *προψαλάσσω* (241), is by no means perspicuous. Since *ψαλάσσω* was unquestionably used for twanging the lyre (Lycophr. 139 *τοίγαρ ψαλάξεις εἰς κενὸν νευρᾶς κτύπον, | ἄσιτα κἀδώρητα φορμίζων μέλη*), this meaning must surely have been the chief element in the compound (perhaps *ἀποψάλακτος* after Philostr. *vit. soph.* 2. 1. 14 *ἡ γλῶττα τὴν ἄκραν Ἀτθίδα ἀποψάλλει*).—**κατοιχνεῖ τόπου**. The genitive resembles *πεδίων ἐπινίσσεται O.C.* 689. It is descended from the old (partitive) genitive

πρεπτὰ <δ' αὖ> διὰ τόνου φάσματ' ἔγ-
χωρ' ἐπανθεμίζει·
τὸ πρᾶγμα δ' οἵπερ πορεύω βάδην,
ἴσθι τὸν δα[ί]μον' ὅστις ποθ' ὃς 325
ταῦτ' ἐτεχνήσατ', οὐκ ἄλλος ἐστὶν κλ[οπεὺς
ἀντ' ἐκείνου, γύναι, σάφ' ἴσθι.
σὺ δ' ἀντὶ τῶνδε μὴ χαλε-
φθῇς ἐμοὶ <μη> δὲ δυσφορηθῇς.

322 πρεπτὰ δ' αὖ Hunt: πρεπτά (sic) pap., sed πρ reformavit pap.[2] **323** ἐπανθεμίζεται legisse Theonem in marg. testatur pap.[2] **324** οἵπερ coni. Hunt: οὕπερ pap. sed litteram υ seclusit pap.[2] **329** ἐμοὶ μηδὲ coni. Hunt: εμοι δε pap., μηδὲ Wilamowitz

of place which survives in the Homeric δώκεσθαι πεδίοιο. But in both cases the preposition assists the construction: see Kuehner-Gerth I 404.

322 f. See cr. nn. πρεπτά in agreement with φάσματα is supported by Hesych. III p. 369 πρεπτά· φαντάσματα, εἰκόνες, which, as Wilamowitz suggests, may relate to this particular passage. Hunt gives two versions: (1) 'the song plucks local images.' Or (2) with ἐπανθεμίζει intransitive: 'fantasies flit over the scene,' like a bird or bee from flower to flower. I prefer the latter alternative and take Theon's variant, which is against the metre, to be an acknowledgment of the intransitive use of ἐπανθεμίζει. But I should prefer to render: 'visions revealed by the straining chords are spread around us (ἔγχωρα, predicative) like a carpet of flowers.' Similarly in Aesch. *Cho.* 150, where ἐπανθίζειν 'to make to blossom' is transitive, there is the same comparison of sound to flowers. The variegated ποικιλία of the lyre (319) is expressed as ἄνθεσα. For the τόνοι of the lyre (ἐπτατονοι) cf. Ar. *Eq.* 532. Stahl, who thinks that ἐπανθεμίζει must be transitive, makes ἄμφὶ the subject, and reads ἔγχωρα for ἔγχωρα.

324 ff. On the assumption that the text is sound in the main, the baldness of style and clumsiness of structure are quite unlike Sophocles. Wilamowitz gives up the first line as corrupt, and holds that the sense required is τὸ πρᾶγμα ὃ πατέρχομαι. Translate rather: 'this is the point to which I am gradually conducting my search (τὸ πρᾶγμα = τὸ χρῆμα in 213): whoever he the god who devised this trick, the thief is none other than he, lady, you may be sure.' (1) οἵπερ seems indispensable here, as in Eur. *Hel.* 1670, since οὕπερ would be scarcely intelligible. Where the verb is in the perfect tense, as in *Trach.* 40, the case may be different. (2) I understand οἵπερ as having a personal reference, *i.e.* to τὸν δαίμονα in the following clause. See on fr. 191 and cf. Hdt. 9. 1 ὅκου δὲ ἑκάστοτε γένοιτο, τούτου παρελάμβανε, *Phil.* 456 ff., and for the relative clause put first Kuehner-Gerth II 420 Anm. 2. The extraordinary circumlocutions are due to the chorus being afraid to come to the point (cf. 328 f.). [δ' τὸν δαίμονα' is an anticipated accusative, but instead of being resumed as the subject (or object) of a subordinate clause, ἐκείνου takes its place. So *El.* 1366. For a similar looseness of connexion see on Eur. *Phoen.* 101. (4) Instead of the subordinate clause for which we are looking, there follows what now becomes the main sentence, as if ἴσθι which precedes were as much parenthetic as σάφ' ἴσθι which follows (*O.T.* 1022, 1117, fr. 282 n.l. (5) ὅστις ποθ' ὃς is strangely substituted for ὅστις ποτ' ἦν ὅτι, which is itself an unusual amphibolia of ὅστις. In *O.T.* 1349 ὅλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν ὅτι κτλ. Hermann cut out ἦν. *O.T.* 373 οὐδεὶς ὅτι οὐχὶ κτλ.—ἄλλος...ἀντ' ἐκείνου: for the pleonasm see on Eur. *Hel.* 574, Starkie on Ar. *Nub.* 653.

For Hermes in the character of a thief cf. Cornut. 16 p. 25, 13 Lang κλέπτην αὐτὸν παρέδωκαν. The evidence is collected by Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* p. 1338, and by Eitrem in Pauly Wissowa VIII 780.

Stahl, reading οὗ πέρι πρωτεύω, with ὡς for ὅτι and τοῦτ' for ταῦτ', makes τὸ πρᾶγμα the anticipated object of ἐτεχνήσατο, with ὡς following ἴσθι.

329 See cr. n. Wilamowitz thinks that this and the preceding line are not part of the strophe, but form a tetrameter

ΚΤ. [τίς ἔχει πλά]νη σε; τίνα κλοπὴν ὠνείδισ[ας; 330
XO. [οὐ μὰ Δία σ', ὦ πρέσ]βειρα, χειμάζειν [θέλω.
ΚΤ. [τὸν δ' ἐκ Διὸς βλαστό]ντα φηλήτην καλ[εῖς;
XO. [. . . . .] ἂν αὐτῇ τῇ κλο[πῇ.
ΚΤ. [. . . . .]ε[ἴ γε τἀ]λ[ηθῆ λέ]γεις.
XO. [. . . . . τ]ἀληθῆ λέγ[ω. 335
[. . . . . κεκλο]φέναι σαφ[
[. . . . .]. δὲ βοῦς πάνυ
[. . . . .]α καθήρ[μ]ο[σε
[. . . . .]λου τεμὼν [
[. . . . .]φο . δ[ο]ρᾷ 340

desunt versus duo vel tres

Col. xiv ΚΤ. [. . . . .] ἄρτι μανθάνω χρόνῳ
[. . . . . ἐγχ]άσκοντα τῇ μῇ μωρίᾳ
[. . . . . ο]ὐδέν, ἀλλὰ παιδιᾶς χάριν. 345
[σὺ δ' οὖν τὸ λοιπὸ]ν εἰς ἔμ' εὐδίαν ἔχων,
[εἴ σοι φέρει χάρ]μ' ἤ τι κερδαίνειν δοκεῖς,
[ὅπως θέλεις κά]χαζε καὶ τέρπου φρένα·

332 supplevit Mekler | *φιλητην* pap. **336** quatenus processerit stichomythia non liquet **340** *δορα*[pap.: corr. Robert

catalectic closing the preceding acatalectic series. The text is unfortunately defective at 369, where it might have decided the question.—**δυσφορηθῆς** implies *δυσφορεῖσθαι*, of which there is no trace except as a variant in Xen. *Cyr.* 2. 2. 5. For the passive form of the aorist see on frs. 164, 837.

331 **χειμάζειν**, *to annoy, vex, distress*, —in a less severe sense than in 267 (n.). The use seems to have been colloquial (cf. *Ant.* 391), and is glossed with *ἐνοχλεῖν* by Ammon. p. 146, quoting Menander *ἐν Ἡνιόχῳ* (fr. 208, III 60 K.). Cf. fr. 404, 6 (III 117 K.) *ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκαλύπτῳ καὶ ταλαιπώρῳ βίῳ | χειμαζόμενος ζῇ.* fr. 970 (III 248 K.). Philem. fr. 28, 10 (II 485 K.).

332 Mekler's supplement is slightly preferable to Hunt's *μῶν τὸν Διὸς παῖδ' ὄντα*.—**φηλήτην**: see cr. n. and fr. 933 n. Maas (*B. ph. W.* 1912, 1076) reverts to the form *φιλήτης*, on the ground that it is also supported by the wooden tablet of the *Hecale*, and by the papyrus of Hellanicus (*Ox. Pap.* 1084. 3). It is certainly remarkable that the text of Hellanicus by affirming the derivation from *φιλεῖν* seems to indicate that he employed *φιλήτης*, but we cannot feel certain that the statement really goes back to the supposed original. For a similar error see 358 and fr. 171 (*ψιλαφᾷ* for *ψηλαφᾷ*). The word was particularly associated with Hermes from the Homeric hymn (292, 446) onwards. Besides Hellanicus, see Eur. *Rhes.* 217 *Ἑρμῆς, ὅς γε φηλητῶν ἄναξ*. *CIG* 2299 (Kaibel, *ep.* 1188) *Ἑρμῆν τὸν κλέπτην τίς ὑφείλετο; θερμὸς ὁ κλέπτης | ὃς τῶν φηλητέων ᾧχετ' ἄνακτα φέρων.*

333 **κλοπῇ**. Hunt thinks this is concrete as in Eur. *Hel.* 1675 (= thing stolen), and suggests *ὅν γ' ἐντυχὼν λάβοιμ' ἄν*. But we might as well have *καὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ λαθεῖν ἄν*—for all his thievery (cf. 162). For the metre see p. 230.

344 f. The gaps are well filled by Mekler with *πονηρέ σ' ἐγχάσκοντα* and *δρᾷς δ' ὑγιὲς οὐδέν*. He supposes that a new sentence begins with *ἄρτι* in 343.

346 **εἰς ἔμ' εὐδίαν ἔχων**: *at your ease so far as I am concerned, i.e.* I shan't interfere with you. Cf. Protag. fr. 9 (Diels, *Vorsokr.*[2] p. 540, 3) *εὐδίης γὰρ εἶχετο* = 'he remained undisturbed.' For *εἰς* cf. *O.C.* 1121 *τήνδε τὴν ἐς τάσδε μοι | τέρψιν*. Jebb on *O.T.* 706.

348 **κάχαζε**: *Ai.* 199.

[τὸν παῖδα δ' ὄ]ντα τοῦ Διὸς σαφεῖ λόγῳ
[μὴ βλάπτε κιν]ῶν ἐν νέῳ νέον λόγον. 350
[οὗτος γὰρ οὔτε] πρὸς πατρὸς κλέπτης ἔφυ
[οὔτ' ἐγγενὴς μ]ήτρωσιν ἡ κλοπὴ κρατεῖ.
[σὺ δ' ἄλλοσ' εἴ τ]ις ἐστι, τὸν κλέπτην σκόπει
[καὶ γῆν ἄ]καρπον· τοῦδε δ', οὗ πλανᾷ δόμους,
[αἴν]ει γένος, πρόσαπτε τὴν πονηρίαν 355
[προ]ς ὄντιν' ἥκει· τῷδε δ' οὐχ οὕτω πρέπει.
[ἀλλ'] αἰὲν εἶ σὺ παῖς· νέος γὰρ ὢν ἀνὴρ

350 supplevi **352** sqq. initia supplevi **354** δ' οὗ πλανᾷ δόμους scripsi: τουτανα δομοις pap., δ supra τ et spiritum asperum supra ου add. pap.[2], δ' οὗ πεινῇ δόμους Wilamowitz **355** ἄθρει Wilamowitz **356** δ' ex τ' corr. pap.[2] **357** εισι pap.

350 μὴ βλάπτε κινῶν. I have preferred this to Hunt's *μὴ σκῶπτε ποιῶν*, because to accuse a god of theft is fitly described as an injurious slander, and *κινῶν* is somewhat more apt (see Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 1397) than *ποιῶν*. 'Stirring up a new charge against a new-born child.' Note the careless repetition of *λόγον* in a somewhat different sense, and see Jebb on *O.C.* 554. For **ἐν** (= in relation to) cf. *Ant.* 551 *ἐν σοὶ γελῶ*. *Ai.* 1092 *μὴ...ἐν θανοῦσιν ὑβριστὴς γένῃ*. *Id.* 1315 *ἐν ἐμοὶ θρασύς*. Eur. *Med.* 206 *τὸν ἐν λέχει προδόταν*.

351 πρὸς πατρός. So *πρὸς αἵματος El.* 1125, *Ai.* 1305.

352 ἐγγενὴς follows *El.* 1328. Wilamowitz supplied *οὐτ' αὖτις ἐν.*— **κρατεῖ**: *prevails, i.e.* maintains itself. Cf. Thuc. 1. 71 *ἀνάγκη δὲ ὥσπερ τέχνης ἀεὶ τὰ ἐπιγιγνόμενα κρατεῖν*.

353 Hunt's *εἰ δὴ κλοπή τίς ἐστι* leaves the sentence incomplete. **ἄλλοσε** was suggested by *El.* 1474 *μηκέτ' ἄλλοσε σκόπει*.

354 καὶ γῆν ἄκαρπον: or perhaps *ἄγρον τ' ἄκαρπον*. Hunt reads *ἄπορον ἄκαρπον*, but **ἄκαρπον** can scarcely be the epithet of a person, and the grammatical relation of the adjectives is obscure.— **τοῦδε κτέ.**: see cr. n. If the disappearance of Λ before Δ was due to haplography, the reading given in the text is closer to the original than the conjecture of Wilamowitz, which Hunt adopts. The rough breathing (*οὗ*) may, of course, have been an error, but that is less likely to have occurred in a text where smooth breathings are not recorded. Lastly, *γένος*, whether preceded by *ἄθρει* or by *αἶνει*, is undoubtedly clearer if combined with *τοῦδε* than if isolated. On the other hand, Philostr. *imag.* 1 25. 1 *οὗ τι πω ταῦτα πενίᾳ δρῶν ὁ θεὸς* may be quoted in favour of *πεινῇ*.

355 αἶνει; see cr. n. I formerly suggested *ὄπει*, but *αἶνει* 'respect' is much better, and may be recommended independently of the reading adopted in the last line. Cf. Eur. fr. 395 *τὴν μὲν γὰρ εὐγένειαν αἰνοῦσιν βροτοί*. Theodect. fr. 15 (Nauck, p. 806) *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖσαν' εὐγένειαν ἡσύχα*. Aesch. fr. 300 *γένος μὲν αἰνεῖν ἐκμαθὼν ἐπίσταμαι | Αἰθιοπίδος γῆς*.

356 ἥκει (= *προσήκει*), comes *fittingly*, as in *O.C.* 738 *οὔτοι' ἦκέ μοι γένει | τὰ τοῦδε πεισθεῖν πήματ' ἐς πλεῖστον πόλεως*, where, as Ellendt has pointed out, the passages usually quoted in illustration are not really parallel. In Ar. *Plut.* 919 (quoted by Hunt) *ἥκει* = 'devolves upon.'—**πρέπει**: *sc.* *προσάπτειν τὴν πονηρίαν*.

357 f. The connexion of thought appears to be as follows. 'But, instead of bidding you to desist, I ought to remember that this ridiculous charge is characteristic of you. You never cease your childish ways: though a full-grown man' (so *νεανίαν* in fr. 310, 73) 'with a thick beard' (*i.e.* no longer *μειράκιον* or *ἀγένειος*) 'you are as wanton as a goat surfeited with thistles.' Wilamowitz, reading *κνηκῷ*, understands 'you swagger with your yellow goat-beard'; but the simile is exactly on a line with fr. 848 *σὺ δὲ σφαδάζεις πῶλος ὡς εὐφορβίᾳ*, and the comparison of wanton conduct to the skittishness of an overfed animal was evidently familiar. Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1305 *ἀνηλλεν', ἐσκίρτα, 'πεπάρδει κἀγέλα | ὥσπερ καχρύων ὀνίδιον εὐψυχημένον*. Theogn. 1249 *παῖ, σὺ μὲν αὖτως ἵππος, ἐπεὶ κριθῶν ἐπορέσθη, | αἰθὶς ἐπὶ σταθμοῖσ*

π[ώγ]ωνι θάλλων ὡς τράγος κνήκῳ χλιδᾷς.
παύου τὸ λεῖον φαλακρὸν ἡδονῇ πιτνάς.
[ο]ὐκ ἐκ θεῶν τὰ μωρὰ καὶ γέλοια χρὴ
[χ]ανόντα κλαίειν ὕστερ', ὡς <σ'> ἐγὼ γελῶ;
XO. στρέφου λυγίζου τε μύθοις, ὁποί- (ἀντιστρ.)
αν θέλεις βάξιν εὕρισκ' ἀπό-
ψηκτον· οὐ γάρ με ταῦτα πείσεις
<ὅ>πως τὸ χρῆμ' οὗτος εἰργασμένος
ῥινοκόλλητον ἄλλων ἔκλεψεν βοῶν
που δορὰ[ς ἢ] 'πὸ τῶν Λοξίου.
μή με τᾶ[σδ' ἐ]ξ ὁδοῦ βίβαζε.
desunt versus fere quattuor

358 κνικωι pap. **360** εἰς θεοὺς Wilamowitz | λοια χρη in ras. pap.[2] **361** υστερωιτεγωγελω pap., τ supra prius γ et υστερωσεγω in marg. add. pap.[2], ὕστερ'; ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω Hunt, ὑστέρως, ἐγὼ λέγω Wilamowitz **362** sq. μύθοις | ὁποίαν pap. **363** θέλεις ex θέλοις corr. pap.[2] **365** ὅπως Wilamowitz et Murray: πως pap | χρῆμα οὗτος legisse Theonem testatur pap.[2]: χρηματουτεσ pap.

ἥλυθες ἡμετέρους. The correction εἶ σύ seems inevitable; but Wilamowitz, who insists that Silenus is still on the stage and must be the person addressed, makes the violent alteration of νέος to πάλαι. Hunt has shown that the young satyrs are often represented as bald-headed and that the taunt may be quite well addressed to the chorus. Cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 434 νεανίας γὰρ εἶ.

359 Hunt renders 'cease courting pleasure with your bald pate,' but does not explain the peculiarity of the language. No satisfactory result can be deduced from the interpretation of πιτνάς either as *spreading* or *strewing* (Hes. *Scut.* 291). It is suggested, therefore, that πίτνημι is used here in the figurative sense of *to flutter* or *excite*, a meaning which is perhaps justified by Hom. σ 160 ὅπως πετάσειε μάλιστα | θυμὸν μνηστήρων, and by φρένας ἐκπεπετασμένος if that is read *id.* 327.

360 f. See cr. n. 'Take care that the *gods* don't punish your foolish jests, and give me cause to laugh at the tears that will follow.' The order of the words shows that considerable stress is laid on ἐκ θεῶν, for which see n. on fr. 326. The final clause ὡς ἐγὼ γελῶ ironically represents the natural result of an action as the purpose of the agent. Cf. *e.g.* Hom. B 359, ἀπτέσθω ἧς νηὸς...δφρα πρόσθ' ἄλλων θάνατον καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπῃ. The addition of σ' improves the antithesis, and is scarcely a ponderable alteration. Hunt, putting a question after ὕστερ', reads ὡς ἐγὼ λέγω, and suggests that σ' should be added after κλαίειν. Wilamowitz alters ἐκ θεῶν to εἰς θεούς, and ends the sentence with ὑστέρως, ἐγὼ λέγω (coll. Eur. fr. 499). For the adverbial acc. ὕστερα see Kuehner-Gerth I 310.

362 στρέφου, *shuffle*, recalls Ar. *Ach.* 385 (Starkie's n.).

363 f. ἀπόψηκτον: wiped clean, and so, keen-scented, sharp, acute. The best illustration of the metaphor is Hor. *Sat.* I. 4. 8 *emunctae naris* (of Lucilius). Cf. Lucian *navig.* 45 καίτοι ἐνὸς τοῦ ἀναγκαιοτάτου προσδεῖ, ὃς περιθέμενόν σε παύσει μωραίνοντα, τὴν πολλὴν ταύτην κόρυζαν ἀποξύσας. Plat. *rep.* 343 A κορυζῶντα περιορᾷ καὶ οὐκ ἀπομύττει δεόμενον. Hunt, however, prefers to understand the word, which does not occur elsewhere, as equivalent to 'well-groomed,' *i.e.* elaborate; and Wilamowitz gives it an active sense—removing suspicion, exculpatory.—For the redundance of ταῦτα cf. *O.T.* 1058 οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο τοῦθ', ὅπως ἐγὼ...οὐ φανῶ τοὐμὸν γένος.

365 ff. τὸ χρῆμα: cf. 136.—ῥινοκόλλητον is not complementary to the verb (proleptic), but is employed in accordance with the common Greek idiom, which used to be known as the tertiary predicate. Translate: 'now, since the thing that he made was of glued hides, he could

Col. xv . . . . . .

ΧΟ. [ὁ Ζ]εὺς γὰρ [
ΚΥ. [ὁ] παῖς κλο[π
ΧΟ. [εἴ] τοι πονη[ρὰ δρᾷ, πονηρὸς ὢν κυρεῖ.
ΚΥ. [κ]ακῶς ἀκού[ειν οὐ πρέπει Διὸς γόνῳ.
ΧΟ. [ε]ἰ δ' ἔστ' ἀλη[θῆ, χρή με καὶ λέγειν τάδε.
ΚΥ. [ο]ὐ μὴ τάδ' [εἴπῃς

. . . . . .

ΚΥ. [
ΧΟ. [
ΚΥ. τ[
ΧΟ. ι[
ΚΥ. υ[
ΧΟ. [
ΚΥ. λ[
ΧΟ. γ . [. . . .]α . . [
ΚΥ. πο[ῦ] καὶ βόας νέμουσι τ[
ΧΟ. π[λ]είους δέ γ' ἤδη νῦν [
ΚΥ. τίς, ὦ πονήρ', ἔχει; τί πλ[
ΧΟ. ὁ παῖς ὃς ἔνδον ἐστὶν ἐγκεκλῃ[μένος.
ΚΥ. [τὸ]ν παῖδα παῦσαι τοῦ Διὸς [κακῶς λέγων.
ΧΟ. π[α]ύοιμ' [ἂ]ν [εἰ] τὰς βοῦς τις ἐ[
ΚΥ. ἤδη με πν[ί]γεις καὶ σὺ χα[ἱ βόες σέθεν.

390 ὃς Wilamowitz et Murray: τοδ pap., δδ' pap.[2] | ἐστὶν supplevit pap.[2] **391** ον supra παυσαι (*i.e.* παύου) add. pap.[2] | τὸν Διὸς Wilamowitz **392** δ in marg. quadringentesimo versui adscriptum **393** πνε[.]γεις pap.

not have stolen them from any other cattle than Apollo's. Don't try to turn me from this track.'—**ἢ 'πό.** For the preposition accompanying the second noun only cf. Eur. *Hel.* 863 Τροίας δὲ σωθεὶς κἀπὸ βαρβάρου χθονός, and see on fr. 20. —**ὁδοῦ**: the metaphor of the trail is renewed from 324.

375 If the sense is correctly restored, it may be illustrated by Eur. fr. 336 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐσθλὸς εὐγενὴς ἔμοιγ' ἀνὴρ κτέ. Astyd. fr. 8 (Nauck, p. 780) γένους δ' ἔπαινός ἐστιν ἀσφαλέστατος | κατ' ἄνδρ' ἐπαινεῖν ὅστις ἂν δίκαιος ᾖ | τρόπους τ' ἄριστος, τοῦτον εὐγενῆ καλεῖν.

389 Rossbach completes the line with τί πλείονας λέγεις; Mekler suggested τί πλαγιάζεις πάλιν ('what new trick is this?).'

391 See cr. n. τὸν Διός, proposed by Wilamowitz, would be in accordance with the general rule, if it is desired to lay the chief stress on the genitive. But there are many examples where the attributive genitive follows the governing noun without a repetition of its article. See Kuehner-Gerth 1 § 464, Anm. 1.

392 Wilamowitz completed the line with ἐξελᾶν θέλοι, which is adopted by Hunt. But **παύοιμ' ἄν** cannot be intransitive (Eur. *Hel.* 1319 n.). We might of course read (*e.g.*, λώβης σε χρή in 391), and take παῦσαι as aor. inf. act. But the variant παύου shows that παῦσαι was regarded as an imperative, so that this expedient is improbable. Probably then we should supply εἴ τις ἐξάγοι, στόμα (or λόγον) or the like. Anyhow ἐξελᾶν as present infinitive is better avoided.

393 is an echo of *Ant.* 573 ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς καὶ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὸν λέχος, with the comic tone indicated by the use of πνίγεις.

ΧΟ. [. . .]λεισεπρ[. . .]υ[. ἐ]ξελαυν[

desunt versus fere undeviginti

Col. xvi πελέθοις βοῶν [414

desunt versus fere duodecim

Col. xvii . . . . . .

[

[

[

[430

ΧΟ. ἰοὺ ἰοὺ [

ἦν τ᾽ ἔφη π[

οὗτος οὐ φ[

ΣΙ. ὦ Λ[οξία

ἰὼ δ[435

ΧΟ. ὦ Λοξία δε[

καὶ παρη[

τῶν [β]οῶ[ν

ΑΠ. [.]νυ . [

ε[.]ει[440

βο[

ὁπο[

πρ[

μισθὸς [

ἐλεύθερο[445

ΣΙ. τὸν ἐγ[

394 ἀπολεῖ σε coni. Murray **414** columna omnino periit, nisi quod verba π]ελέθοις βοῶν Theonem legisse in marg. testatur pap.[2] **431** post ἰοὺ ἰοὺ litterae π[.]γ. deletae sunt **432** τ ex δ corr. pap.[2]

For this word see Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 1036, who shows that it is commonly used in the New Comedy as well as in Lucian. L. and S.'s account is incomplete.—For the contemptuous pronoun (*καὶ βόες σέθεν*) see on fr. 165.

394 Murray's ἀπολεῖ σε is plausible, but it is difficult to complete the line, unless the speech of the chorus extended beyond a single verse.

414 For the palaeographical data bearing on the position of this column see Hunt's note.

431 ff. The remains of Col. XVII appear to belong to a scene in which Apollo had returned to the stage, and had learnt from the chorus of the success of their search. Consequently he tells them that they have earned their rewards. Probably Silenus also reappeared at this point, whereas Cyllene had retired discomfited. We might suggest that the suspicions of the chorus had been confirmed by some visual evidence, which prepared the way for their triumph. Hunt concludes that a single column has been lost between 394 and 431, and so much space at least seems to be required.

445 ἐλεύθεροι δ᾽ ἔσεσθε τὸν πάντα χρόνον (Rossbach), but λοιπόν should at any rate be substituted for the unmetrical πάντα.

315

ἐνήλατα ξύλα τρίγομφα διατορεῦσαι σε δεῖται

315 Pollux 10. 34 *μέρη δὲ κλίνης ἐνήλατα καὶ ἐπίκλιντρον, τὸ μέν γε ἐπίκλιντρον ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους* (fr. 44, 1 403 K.) *εἰρημένον· Σοφοκλῆς δ' ἐν Ἰχνευταῖς σατύροις ἔφη 'ἐνήλατα . δεῖται.'*

Rutherford (*New Phryn.* p. 267) pronounces these words to be 'too corrupt to convey any meaning.' The conjectures hitherto recorded assume that the sense required is 'the posts must be pierced with nails.' Thus Pauw (after Hemsterhuis) conjectured *τριγόμφοις διατορεῦσαι δεῖ*, and Valckenaer on *Phoen.* 1186 (1179) *ἐνήλατα τρίγομφα διατορεῖν σε δεῖ*, omitting *ξύλα*. Lobeck (*Phryn.* p. 178) gave as alternatives *ἐνήλατα ξυλ <ουργέ> γόμφοις διατορεῖν σε δεῖ*, and *ἐνήλατα ξύγγομφα διατρῆσαί σε δεῖ*, with the obscure comment 'spondas prius ad eum finem perforatas *συγγομφῶσαι*.' But none of these suggestions is satisfactory. **ἐνήλατα** are the four posts or bars—'bedrails'—which, when jointed together, form the framework of the *κλίνη*; they are supported by the feet, which are screwed into them. Cf. Hesych. 1 p. 193 *ἑρμῖνα· πόδα κλίνης· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνείρεσθαι τῷ ἐνηλάτῳ.* Phrynichus (CLV R.) states that *κραστήρια* is the correct Attic term for *ἐνήλατα*, but there is no material to test his authority. The meaning is placed beyond doubt by Artemid. *oneirocr.* 1. 74, quoted by Mau in Pauly-Wissowa III 370. The interpretation of **τρίγομφα** and **διατορεῦσαι** is doubtful; but I think it is possible to get nearer to the truth. (1) The sense usually given to *τρίγομφα*, 'fastened with three nails,' is absurd. I should rather suppose that it means 'firmly-bolted,' and that *τρι-* has the same force as in *τριγέρων, τρίδουλος, τριπάλαι, τριπανοῦργος, τρισάθλιος* and many others. (2) **διατορεῦσαι** is not *to bore through*, but *to engrave, chase*; and, although it may be an error for **διατορῆσαι** or **διατορεῖν σε**, the corruption is not likely. On the other hand, the context does not suggest an allusion to *τορευτική*; for, although the bedstead of Odysseus was adorned with gold, silver and ivory (Hom. ψ 200), the verb required here must have been appropriate to *ξύλα*. But *τορεύειν* and its cognates are constantly confused with *τορνεύειν* etc.; and *διατορνεύειν*, *to finish off with the lathe*, is exactly what we want (Hom. Γ 391). I suggest, therefore, that we should read something like *ξύλα | ἐνηλάτων τρίγομφα διατορνεύσεως | δεῖται*, or perhaps simply *διατορνεύσεται*. In Aelian *var. hist.* 14. 7 perhaps *διατορνευθέντες* would be an improvement for *διατορευθέντες* (cf. *ἀποτορνεύω*). I find that Blaydes has suggested *ἐνήλατ' οὖν τρίγομφα τορνεῦσαί σε δεῖ*, besides alternatives; and Herwerden *ἐνήλατα | <κλινῶν> τρίγομφα <πολλὰ> τορνεῦσαί σε δεῖ*. R. Ellis conjectured *διατόρευτ' ἀποξῦσαί σε δεῖ*. It should be added that Robert guesses that Hermes had concealed the lyre in his mother's bed, and that we should read *δεῖ τρίγομφ' ἐνήλατα | <νῦν> διατορεῦσαι (? διατορῆσαι) σ'*. Even if the facts were as supposed, the method proposed for discovering the lost instrument would be a very strange one. —For Schenkl's view see on fr. 314. 309.

316

ῥικνοῦσθαι

316 Phot. *lex.* p. 489, 1 = Suid. *s.v.* *ῥικνοῦσθαι· τὸ διέλκεσθαι καὶ παντοδαπῶς διαστρέφεσθαι κατ' εἶδος. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ῥικνοῦσθαι* (*ῥιγνοῦσθαι* Phot.) *τὸ καμπύλον γίγνεσθαι ἀσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ συνουσίαν καὶ ὄρχησιν κάμπτοντα τὴν ὀσφύν. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰχνευταῖς.* Cf. Hesych. III p. 429 *ῥικνοῦσθαι· διέλκεσθαι καὶ παντοδαπῶς διαστρέφεσθαι* (*διαφέρεσθαι* cod.) *κατ' εἶδος.* p. 431 *ῥιχνοῦσθαι· κινεῖσθαι ἀσχημόνως.* Moeris p. 208, 25 *ῥικνοῦσθαι· τὸ ἀσχημόνως κινεῖσθαι Ἀττικοί.* There was also the compound *διαρρικνοῦσθαι* mentioned by Pollux 4. 99 among a list of dances and defined as *τὸ τὴν ὀσφὺν φορτικῶς περιάγειν.* To the same effect *Etym. M.* p. 270, 5, who quotes Κράτης (l. Κρατῖνος) Τροφωνίῳ (fr. 219, 1 79 K.): *ξίφιζε καὶ σπόδιζε καὶ διαρρικνοῦ.* The lemma is not a reference to fr. 314, 295.

317

] βραβευμ[α

317 This scrap is taken from *Ox. Pap.* IX 1174 fr. 26, and is reproduced here, because βράβευμα, *an award*, some case of which presumably occurred in the *Ichneutae*, is a new word.

318

βοῦκλεψ

318 βοῦκλεψ Dindorf: βοοικλεψ A, βοόκλεψ C Eustath., βοίκλεψ Musurus

318 Athen. 409 C τέτριμμαι οἰκότριψ, κέκλεμμαι (C: κέκλαμμαι A) βοῦκλεψ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ Ἑρμῆς. Eustath. *Od.* p. 1401, 15 to the same effect, but without the last three words. Dindorf's conjecture is confirmed by Phryn. *praep. soph.* p. 17, 16 de B. (= Bekk. *anecd.* p. 11, 33).

The discovery of the *Ichneutae* papyrus makes it all but certain that βοῦκλεψ occurred in that play. The fragment was formerly numbered as *incertae sedis* (932 N.[2]).

END OF VOLUME I

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BINDING SECT. APR 8 1980

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

PA
4413
Y9
1917
v.1

Sophocles
Fragments

72